

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. **CLASON**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, at this time, to extend my remarks in the **RECORD**, and include therein a table of statistics furnished me by the Department of Commerce.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. **THOMASON**. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 22 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 11, 1939, at 12 o'clock noon.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII,

Mr. **MALONEY** introduced a bill (H. R. 7578) to authorize the acquisition of land for cemeterial purposes in the vicinity of New Orleans, La., which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. **COLE** of New York introduced a bill (H. R. 7579) granting a pension to Flora Latimore, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5667. By Mr. **BOLLES**: Petition of Polish-American citizens of Racine, Wis., supporting President Roosevelt's neutrality program; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5668. By Mr. **GILLIE**: Petition of 1,000 citizens of Fort Wayne, Ind., urging Congress to retain the embargo on arms and munitions and maintain a policy of strict neutrality; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5669. Also, resolution of the Fort Wayne Junior Chamber of Commerce, urging Congress not to repeal the existing embargo on the sale of arms and munitions to belligerent nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5670. Also, petition of Elsie M. Justus and other members of the Waynedale Methodist Church, Waynedale, Ind., urging Congress to retain the embargo on arms and munitions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5671. By Mr. **THOMAS** of New Jersey: Concurrent resolution adopted by the State Legislature of New Jersey, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact appropriate legislation to prevent profiteering in foodstuffs and commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

5672. By the **SPEAKER**: Petition of the Workers' Alliance of San Francisco, Local W. 483, by Neil Stewart, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Works Progress Administration Work Relief Act; to the Committee on Appropriations.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 11, 1939

(Legislative day of Wednesday, October 4, 1939)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Z. Barney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, Holy Ghost, Sanctifier of the Faithful, visit, we pray Thee, this Nation, our President, Vice President, the Members of the Congress, and all others in authority, with Thy love and favor; enlighten their minds more and more with the light of the everlasting gospel; graft in their hearts

a love of the truth; increase in them true religion; nourish them with all goodness; and of Thy great mercy, keep them therein, O Blessed Spirit, whom, with the Father and the Son together, we worship and glorify as one God, world without end. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. **BARKLEY**, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, October 10, 1939, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. **MINTON**. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **VICE PRESIDENT**. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Davis	King	Reynolds
Andrews	Donahey	La Follette	Russell
Austin	Downey	Lee	Schwartz
Bailey	Ellender	Lodge	Schwellenbach
Bankhead	Frazier	Lucas	Sheppard
Barbour	George	Lundeen	Shipstead
Barkley	Gerry	McCarran	Slatery
Bilbo	Gibson	McKellar	Smathers
Borah	Gillette	McNary	Stewart
Bridges	Green	Maloney	Taft
Brown	Guffey	Mead	Thomas, Okla.
Bulow	Gurney	Minton	Thomas, Utah
Burke	Hale	Murray	Townsend
Byrnes	Harrison	Neely	Truman
Capper	Hatch	Norris	Tydings
Caraway	Herring	Nye	Vandenberg
Chandler	Hill	O'Mahoney	Van Nuys
Chavez	Holman	Overton	Wagner
Clark, Idaho	Holt	Pepper	Wheeler
Clark, Mo.	Hughes	Pittman	White
Connally	Johnson, Calif.	Radcliffe	Wiley
Danaher	Johnson, Colo.	Reed	

Mr. **MINTON**. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. **BONE**] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. **GLASS**] are detained from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. **ASHURST**] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. **BYRD**] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. **HAYDEN**] are members of the committee to attend the convention of the American Association of State Highway Officials in Richmond, Va., and are therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. **MILLER**], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. **SMITH**], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. **WALSH**] are unavoidably detained.

The **VICE PRESIDENT**. Eighty-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Calloway, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 384) to make provision for certain expenses incident to the second session of the Seventy-sixth Congress.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (H. J. Res. 384) to make provision for certain expenses incident to the second session of the Seventy-sixth Congress, and it was signed by the Vice President.

DISCUSSION OF NEUTRALITY BY SENATORS NYE AND PITTMAN AND A PANEL OF OTHER SENATORS

[Mr. **PITTMAN** asked and obtained leave to have printed in the **RECORD** a radio discussion of neutrality by Senators **PITTMAN** and **NYE** and a panel consisting of Senators **CONNALLY**, **DANAHER**, **LUNDEEN**, and **VAN NUYS** on October 1, 1939, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR OVERTON ON PENDING NEUTRALITY LEGISLATION

[Mr. **NYE** asked and obtained leave to have printed in the **RECORD** a radio address on the pending neutrality legislation delivered by Senator **OVERTON** on October 8, 1939, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY HON. J. EDGAR HOOVER ON PROBLEMS OF LAW ENFORCEMENT

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on problems of law enforcement delivered by Hon. J. Edgar Hoover, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, before the annual convention of the International Association of Chiefs of Police in San Francisco, Calif., on October 10, 1939, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY JAMES W. RYAN, ESQ., ON REPEAL OF PRESENT NEUTRALITY ACT

[Mr. SCHWELLENBACH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address in favor of repealing the present Neutrality Act delivered by James W. Ryan, Esq., of the New York Bar, in debate with Prof. Philip C. Jessup at Columbia University Law School on October 10, 1939, which appears in the Appendix.]

NEUTRALITY AND PEACE OF THE UNITED STATES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 306), Neutrality Act of 1939.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Last evening before the Senate took a recess the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] stated that he hoped to secure recognition this morning for the purpose of addressing the Senate on the pending measure. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, as to the gravity and the importance of the questions presented for discussion and consideration by the momentous issues involved in the pending legislation, I agree entirely with the eloquent expressions of the eminent Senators of all persuasions of thought who have preceded me in this debate.

With all that these distinguished statesmen have said as to the necessity for conducting this debate upon the high plane of disinterested, dispassionate, hard-headed discussion, with an eye single to the welfare of the Nation as a whole, I am in wholehearted accord. To approach the discussion of issues of such transcendent importance in any other spirit and from any other standpoint would be utterly unthinkable. I rejoice in the hope that that spirit which has been manifest in the debate up to this time may be continued until the final determination of the issue.

And, Mr. President, I am certain that there will not be any dispute from any quarter of this body, comprising as it does the constitutional representatives of the 48 States, as to a complete adjournment of politics in connection with this grave question, if, indeed, such a suggestion had ever been necessary. It may be universally assumed, as I assume, that every Senator who sits in this Chamber and every Representative who sits in the Chamber at the southern end of the Capitol is actuated under his solemn oath of office by the same high patriotic motives, without any suggestion of partisanship, factionalism, personal interest, or personal animus. It is upon that basis that this debate has proceeded thus far, and it is upon this basis that it should continue to the end, no matter what that end may be. Only a peculiar mental obfuscation upon the part of a few of the "kept" columnists and some of the propagandist editorial writers of some of our metropolitan newspapers could have given rise to the suggestion that a Republican who happens to agree with the President upon such a great nonpartisan issue as the repeal of the arms embargo is a noble, altruistic, patriotic American statesman who has forever foresworn political considerations, while a Democrat who, sworn upon his own oath as an officer of the Government and a servant of his people, still conscientiously adheres to the views vehemently expressed as lately as 3 years ago by the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and the chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, is playing politics, is a factionalist or a partisan. Precisely the same observation applies to those Senators and Representatives—Republicans as to our domestic affairs and policies—who are unable under their own oaths of office to agree with the wisdom of the repeal of the arms embargo as a matter of international policy.

The fact is, Mr. President—and I challenge any Senator to rise in his place to contradict the statement—that the

question of our neutrality policy, with the arms embargo as its heart and soul, has never been in any degree whatever either a partisan or a factional or even a political question. In importance it transcends all party, political, and factional lines. In its present application it cuts directly across all party, factional, or political lines. There has never been any necessity for adjourning politics with regard to neutrality legislation, because there has never been any politics in it, except insofar as the suggestion has been injected into it by those who were opposed to any efficient neutrality policy.

If, on the other hand, Mr. President, the suggestion for an adjournment of politics means, as many editorial writers have assumed, that we, as Senators and Representatives, are to forego our convictions as to the best policies for the safety and well-being of this Nation, should forswear the obligation to our Nation and our constituents which we solemnly assumed when we were sworn into office, should yield to any man or any set of men, no matter how wise or how powerful, our careful and prayerful judgment as to the best means of insuring the safety of the Republic and the perpetuity of our institutions, then I utterly and emphatically repudiate any such doctrine.

It involves no lack of respect for the President of the United States, no criticism of those of our colleagues who adhere to a contrary view, for those of us who believe that the repeal of the mandatory arms embargo is the first step to war to rise in our places as United States Senators and give reason for the faith which is within us. If we did less, we should fail in the plain duty imposed upon us by the Constitution of the United States. If we did less, we should be unworthy of the high trust placed in us by our constituents.

We can best exemplify democracy to the world by demonstrating that in this last citadel of real democracy there is still one forum—the Congress of the United States—where free men, representatives elected by free people, and responsible only to those people, can freely discuss their views for the well-being of our own Republic. For myself, Mr. President, let me say that I hold myself directly responsible and accountable, as I have always held myself, to the people of Missouri, who honored me twice by electing me to this body. If I am alive, I shall be ready on the due date punctually and without fail to appear before the people of Missouri, and give account of my stewardship, and to abide cheerfully by their judgment of it. In the meantime, it seems to me that my plain obligation under my oath of office is to use my very best judgment, my own individual judgment, as to what is the best interests of the Nation.

This obligation, to my mind, Mr. President, is enhanced rather than diminished by the fact that we are facing the determination of our national policy in the face of a grave international situation. Agreeing entirely with the proposition, that in such a situation the views of the President of the United States—any President of the United States, and particularly one enjoying to so remarkable an extent the confidence and affection of the American people—are entitled to most deferential consideration, I nevertheless assert that it is precisely in such situations that the greatest necessity arises for the exercise of the constitutional process of consultation and cooperation between the President and the Congress. Holding the conviction to which I adhere that the repeal of the arms embargo is a first step in the path which leads to war, a step to which I am utterly opposed, I should think myself a poltroon and a coward if I allowed any consideration to prevent me from rising in my place and expressing my view. When our feet have been set upon the path that leads to war, when successive demands are made and acceded to under the whip and spur of emergency, it may be too late to discuss dispassionately questions of policy. Commitments made, even clandestinely, without authority of law, form matters of national policy which cannot be retreated from without national disgrace. We found that in the last war, although we did not learn the full details until 20 years after the war.

To my mind, Mr. President, now is the time for every Senator to speak, or forever after hold his peace. Later, when we go through the successive steps which will be asked

of us of extending loans and credits, of permitting entry to our ports of armed merchantmen, of submitting to increasing partiality as to the violation of our neutral rights, and we are finally asked to agree to a declaration of war, followed by conscription of boys from 18 years and up, and, under whip and spur, by the Army's industrial mobilization plan, which frankly and openly means dictatorship, it will be too late for dispassionate debate. Anyone who then opposes the Fascist plans of the war party will forthwith be branded a "slacker" or a "traitor."

Now is the time for us to consider the path which we are to pursue, to decide upon the guideposts which we are to follow. Now, by the grace of God, we still have that opportunity. With the development of the next situation it may be too late. Therefore, I insist that, irrespective of any party or personal consideration, now is the time for every Member of this body who entertains any real convictions as to our admitted and avowed common purpose of keeping the Nation out of war to stand in his place and declare himself.

Mr. President, I wish as well as I may to make four points today. First, I propose to challenge the secret assumption behind the repeal proposal that it is to our national interest to take sides in the European conflict, and that it is really very clever of us to find this apparently innocuous way of taking sides without telling the people what we are doing. There has been a great deal of dissimulation in the press and various other places as to the purposes of the repeal of the arms embargo. It was only on yesterday that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] had the courage and the manhood to come forward and frankly disclose the purpose of the repeal of the arms embargo when he said that he was going to vote for it because it was an effective means of aiding Great Britain and France—an expression which breathes the very spirit of unneutrality, the essence of unneutrality, contrary to the whole theory of the Neutrality Act.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AUSTIN. I am sure the distinguished Senator from Missouri does not intend to ignore the real spirit, if not the letter, of that statement, made and accurately published yesterday.

That spirit and letter was national defense; and I would not permit a restatement of it in such a manner and with such emphasis as to change its meaning, for of course the purpose and the grand objective is peace—peace for America primarily, and ultimately, if possible, peace for the world—to which objective it has always appeared to me to be necessary that the United States do all things for her self-defense.

We started to do that at the beginning of the Seventy-sixth Congress, and we have continued in that course ever since, both in the Military Affairs Committee and in the Foreign Relations Committee. That is my position. It is for national defense that I have said that we should speed up the victory of the Allies, because the very last thing in the world that America as a nation will do is to put her sons and daughters in battle. Certainly I do not believe that America will ever send her sons and daughters across the sea to participate in armed conflict; belligerency is the very last thing the United States will engage in, even as a matter of national defense; but, in the meantime, my sincere view is that we shall protect the institutions and the peace of the United States by affording access—the easiest access that is feasible—to the Allies for all the resources that we have, short of sons and daughters.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I certainly do not wish to do the Senator from Vermont any injustice. I hold in my hand a United Press dispatch of yesterday under the headline, "Senator AUSTIN says 'United States should help Allies win,'" which I shall be glad to insert in the RECORD. The Senator says it is an accurate report of his views and of what he said, and I ask unanimous consent that I may insert this article in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of October 10, 1939]

SENATOR AUSTIN SAYS UNITED STATES SHOULD HELP ALLIES WIN

Senator WARREN R. AUSTIN (Republican, Vermont) said today he is supporting President Roosevelt's neutrality program because he believes removal of the arms embargo will help Great Britain and France win the war.

He admitted his attitude was "a selfish one," but said he felt the pending bill should be described as a national defense act rather than neutrality legislation.

Referring to the proposed repeal of the embargo, allowing any nation to purchase arms and munitions here on a take-title-and-carry basis, he said: "In order to protect the interest of the United States, we are making it possible for Britain and France to obtain resources to speed up their triumph in the war."

Senator AUSTIN said he feared a victory for Germany would threaten American institutions and, for that reason, contended his was "a patriotic attitude from the citizen's viewpoint."

FIRST ADMISSION

Senator AUSTIN's statement was the first admission by a Senator supporting the administration that the pending bill would aid the Allies. Isolationists charge that repeal of the embargo would give Britain and France the advantage by virtue of their superior navies. Proponents of repeal, however, charge that the present embargo gives the advantage to Germany because, they claim, Germany doesn't need to buy arms here.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will yield in a moment. I intend to refer later in detail to the proposition which he has enunciated, which is to the effect that the French and the British are fighting our battles. I intend to express views in entire dissent to those of the Senator from Vermont, because if I believed that the French and the British were fighting our battles I think it would be national stultification for us not to go in frankly as their ally, instead of dealing with them on terms of hucksters of arms and munitions. As I have stated, I intend to return to that later, and I do not wish to take it up at this particular time in my remarks. I now yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Missouri. I have no intention of debating with him about this matter. I merely wanted to state that the version of the interview which was printed, and which he has asked to have inserted in the RECORD, is not a complete statement.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I shall be glad to insert the Senator's complete statement, if he desires.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of October 10, 1939]

NEUTRALITY BILL STYLED ACT OF SELF-DEFENSE BY AUSTIN—VERMONT SENATOR SAYS UNITED STATES MUST DO "EVERYTHING TO HASTEN ALLIES' VICTORY"

Senator AUSTIN, Republican, of Vermont, described the administration neutrality bill today as "an act of self-defense, because it is designed to aid Great Britain and France."

"We must do everything we can to hasten the victory of the Allies," he told reporters. "We do not need to ask whether this bill is neutral. We only need to know that it's an act of self-defense."

"In order to protect our interests, we must make it possible for Great Britain and France to get supplies. That may be regarded as selfishness on our part, but at the same time it can be patriotic."

Senator AUSTIN, assistant minority leader, is one of half a dozen Republican Senators supporting the administration measure. It would repeal the embargo on arms sales to warring countries, which would have to pay cash (or get 90-day credits) for all American purchases. These would have to be transported in foreign ships.

VOTE ON TOBEY PLAN TODAY

Senator AUSTIN expressed his views shortly before the Senate began the sixth day of neutrality debate. The Chamber agreed to vote at 2 p. m. on a motion by Senator TOBEY, Republican, of New Hampshire, to divide the bill into two parts.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, in the second place, I propose to show that the contention echoed by repeal spokesmen here on the floor, that we cannot have both the embargo and the cash and carry, is, on the record, a gigantic piece of public foolery. That the men who are for the embargo now have been the ones who have fought on this floor for a strict cash and carry.

Third, I wish to point out briefly five weaknesses in the proposed cash and carry which make it a sieve instead of a

fortress for our peace and security, and to ask the country to wake up to the fact that it is being offered not only something which is no alternative to the embargo but is far from being the stone wall it is advertised to be. Now they call it cash and carry. A few days ago they called it cash and carry. It has already degenerated into credit and carry. Very soon it will be crash and carry, and I fear very much that before we get through it will be clash and carry—carry the debts forever.

Finally, I wish to make a proposal that this Congress do not adjourn before it has established a joint committee of representative leaders of the various schools of thought on foreign policy in the Senate and House, to be joined by administration representatives from the State, Commerce, Justice, and Treasury Departments, for permanent consultation on this Nation's acts and policies, to meet the emergencies of the war in Europe. It is my plan that this committee sit regularly, not only when Congress is out of session but when it is in session, and that all the war emergency measures to be undertaken to meet the acts of other nations, whether growing out of belligerent acts in Latin American waters or out of British cornering of the wool and tin and rubber markets, be discussed by the administration with these leaders of Congress. I shall revert to this later.

Mr. President, it is an open secret in the Senate that there are many in and out of the Senate who believe that we should choose sides in the war. It is no extraordinary coincidence that these men favor repeal of the embargo. They think it means a safe choosing of sides without, perhaps, too much danger to our peace. As one Senator said over the radio the other night, they want to blow Hitler off the earth without getting into the war. All this is an open secret to the Senate. It is, however, not generally realized by the people of the country that such a repeal of the embargo is actually a quiet process of taking sides in the war.

I wish to challenge as openly and effectively as I can the secret assumption that it is to our best national interest to choose sides in this war. I do not think that it is to our national advantage to choose sides. I wish to challenge also the idea that it is clever of those who wish to choose sides not to take the American people into their confidence and tell them what they are doing in this particular way. There seems to be an idea that if we do not talk about why we are doing this the repeal will have no effect on the will of the American people to stay out of war.

Let me state briefly why I do not think it is to the national interest of our great Nation to orient its policy toward partisanship among the old and new empires pushing each other around on the European Continent.

It is primarily because I have in my head and in my heart a dream of America, a great and lofty belief in the future of our America, which I do not wish to see gassed to death on ancient everlasting battlefields in a quarrel about lands and power unworthy of being the death place of American ideals. I do not wish to see our boys come back home not only wracked with wounds but shocked and poisoned by the revolutionary excesses which every expert and student expects to signal the end of this war—if it should be a long war.

I do not think America should be partisan in this war, because I do not think we need either the help of the British Navy or the French Army to defend this Nation or this hemisphere. I think there would be less damage to the hopes of our young men, to their belief in our Nation, to their respect for us as their advisors, if we did not peddle our blood in return for military help which, in the first place, might never be given us; in the second place, might, under the changed techniques of modern warfare, be of no use to us; and, third, which, in order to have at our disposal, obligates us to fight in Europe or around the world whenever either the British Navy or the French Army or the far-flung colonial empires of either France or England are endangered.

Further, I do not believe that we should orient the fortune of America into the old, old age-long quarrels of Europe, be-

cause I think that if we once get over there again we will never get our boys back. Many of them will die, of course. I think of that fact solemnly. Many of them will come home but will wish they had died, a fact I think of more solemnly. I think also of the fact that at the end of another long war no administration that got us into it could face the people without attempting some huge world-reforming organization, of which American soldiers, policing all the defeated nations, would be an integral part. I see this very certainly as one of the explicit implications of partisanship in this war, and I point out again that in view of such a consequence the debate on partisanship, or upon any course which has the implication, as one of its ultimate consequences, of our choosing sides, should be open, before the eyes of all our citizens, so that all the people of this Nation may understand what is going on and whither we are tending.

I wish to point out to the men who consider the wealth of this Nation one of its important assets, likely to suffer confiscation and repudiation at the end of a long war in which we take part, that the cost of the last war was around \$60,000,000,000, that the cost of another war would almost certainly be greater, and that we could put into the Atlantic, if need be, a naval fleet, if such a fleet still proves to have value, or an airplane fleet that would most assuredly prevent all military attack on this continent from Europe, for a slight fraction of that \$60,000,000,000, and possibly for as little as four or five billion dollars.

But the repudiation of the national debt, the confiscation of private property, are only incidents consequent to partisanship. Even more important is the end of the democracy in this country for which good men fought and died before 1776 and valiantly and persistently thereafter. I see every reason to fear that, once we have become partisan, we would shift over into a planned military dictatorship and stay there for decades.

I do not fear any nation when I speak against our being partisan. I do not fear that Germany or Italy or Russia will treat us differently than it will treat other neutrals, or when our partisanship has led to more and more open and avowed aid, that they will treat us differently than other belligerents—after we become a belligerent.

That is not my fear at all. My fear is that we will ourselves be the victim of our own aberration. Once we believe the siren song that one side is our friend, is fighting our battle, so to speak, then our own noble impulses of loyalty, our own fine eagerness for action, will take us into the slaughter.

This point I wish to make very clear: We cannot be halfway this and halfway that when America's national interest is concerned. If we are misled as to what that interest is, if we are convinced by the men who now are urging the first step in partisanship, then we, because of that one mistake of judgment, that one hasty yielding to years of propaganda by our own leaders, will do the rest, and we will be undone. We will brush aside the distinction now being made that there is a difference between sending our arms in return for gold and giving those arms free. We will brush that aside as the proponents of repeal are now brushing aside the distinction between arms and materials of war. Then, having gone that far, we will brush aside the distinction that there is any difference between giving them arms and sending our own boys over there to use those arms. Our nobleness of spirit, our willingness to sacrifice, our indifference to fine distinctions, our indifference to human life and to debt will sweep us away. We ourselves will make ourselves the victims of an illusion. I do not mean that we will not have help. We will be cheered on by various sources that do not yet see that the end of a long war will end liberty in America as well as end private property and end tolerance.

The time to check partisanship is now, when the first step is being taken. It is my fervent belief that our future will be greater than Europe's past; that it will be far grander than Europe's future. There is a vast continent here for us to help make great and free and prosperous. The partisanship that will surely lead us into a European war will

be a blind alley, an abyss, a dead-end, from which it may take us threescore years to return to the opportunities that are our own, to the young, friendly, and able nations of this hemisphere.

Mr. President, I have said before that the cash-and-carry proposal now before us still leaves so many holes that it is far more like a sieve through which war blood can burst than a fortress for our peace and security. I expect later in this debate to propose several amendments to it. Let me simply summarize now: First, the lack of a prohibition against our treatment of armed belligerent merchant vessels as belligerent naval vessels in our ports is a hole big enough to pour through a whole World War; second, the credit provision is no tower of strength; third, the permitted transshipment of contraband from neutrals to belligerents is a hole made now which the present law did not have; fourth, the discretionary war zones are a hole; fifth, the unlimited war boom allowed by the joint resolution is a hole as big as the German siege guns blew into the Belgian fortresses in 1914.

Later in this debate I shall return to the discussion of these holes. Let me say at this moment that I do not think this sieve is good enough to be offered to the American people as even a false alternative to the arms embargo. We must have both, and both must be foolproof and holeproof.

Mr. President, with these general observations I desire to proceed to a more detailed consideration of the Pittman substitute for the Bloom measure, which is itself a substitute for the Pittman law of 1937, now on the statute books, which was an extension of the Pittman law of 1936, which was an extension and amplification of the Pittman law of 1935. I always love and respect the great ability and the high character of the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I admire his great facility for discourse and the great agility of mind which enables him to meet himself coming back and permits him to shake hands with himself across the illimitable and bloody chasms which separate the various acts which he has introduced and which have borne and are destined to bear his name. It is an agonizing experience for many of us to oppose the PITTMAN of 1939 when we remember with what zest we marched full panoplied to the fray under the gallant leadership of that great chief, the PITTMAN of 1935, the PITTMAN of 1936, the PITTMAN of 1937.

But, Mr. President, before proceeding to a discussion of the merits of the pending committee substitute for the Bloom joint resolution, it is most important that certain illusions and delusions as to the issues involved should be dissipated. A mere statement and brief examination of these false contentions should be sufficient to set them forever at rest.

The impression has been sedulously created—and has found credence in many quarters where ordinary intelligence should have raised an impregnable barrier against it—that there is a conflict between the retention of a mandatory arms embargo and the restoration of a bona fide cash-and-carry plan, or the addition of any of the further safeguards proposed by the present committee substitute. Nothing could possibly be further from the truth. It is the greatest hoax ever attempted on the American people since the alleged discovery of the North Pole by Dr. Cook.

Equally preposterous is the attempt to make it appear that those who favor the retention of the arms embargo are opposed to the restoration of the cash and carry or to any other feature which has been, or may be, proposed for the purpose of strengthening and further safeguarding our neutrality law. No one has ever claimed, so far as I know, that the Neutrality Act now on the statute books is perfect. On the contrary, most of us who have been active in the successive struggles for real neutrality have constantly urged further provisions for tightening the law and strengthening its mandatory provisions. Many of us, myself included, voted against the conference report on the existing law because the conferees had greatly weakened the mandatory provisions of the cash-and-carry section of the act as it had passed the Senate.

My colleagues and I, who since 1935 have been fighting to place and keep upon the statute books of the land a neutrality law designed to keep this country out of war, have been the recipients of a tribute from our honored colleague the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN]. In proposing his substitute joint resolution, in his speech on last Monday, he makes much of the fact that what he proposes is mandatory and is designed to keep American ships out of war trade. By his emphasis on these points he implies that he is responding to widespread expression of what the people want. He contends that the resolution he proposes does not repeal our neutrality legislation. He makes that point, I am sure, because repeal of the embargo provision is, in the minds of many persons, abandonment of the vital principle of the neutrality law; and he knows that the American people would not stand for that, as was evidenced by the popular reaction against the President's suggestion of a repeal of the Neutrality Act and a reliance upon so-called international law.

The Senator from Nevada declares that the carry provision is the "strongest provision" in the proposed law; and he adds: "It is new and it is mandatory."

Mr. President, I appreciate the compliment paid my colleagues and me by the Senator from Nevada when he so recognizes the desirability and validity of the mandatory feature that he makes it his principal point to cite it as a compelling reason for support of his proposal. I am touched when he unequivocally states that so important is the carry section that it is the strongest provision of his proposed law, because the carry idea has been consistently sponsored for the past 4 years by the group of Senators who today stand staunchly for retaining the arms embargo—that faithful band which from the beginning has consistently opposed all efforts to enact a law which would place in the hands of any President the discretion and power to throw our might on the side of one belligerent or group of belligerents in a war.

The idea is not new. It did not originate with the Senator from Nevada or the White House. It originated with members of the group now demanding retention of the arms embargo.

The Senator from Nevada, in his radio address of September 27, makes much of the fact that his proposed measure does not leave discretionary power in the hands of the President. In speaking of the old law, he says:

It will be observed from a consideration of that language that absolute discretion was vested in the President as to whether he should permit our American ships to carry all kinds of articles and materials to a belligerent country, except arms, ammunition, and implements of war. He could permit our vessels to carry to belligerents scrap iron, steel, every kind of metal, oil, gasoline, cotton, and every other kind of raw material, because such materials are not described in existing law under the definition of arms, ammunition, and implements of war. These last-named articles were all described as contraband of war by the belligerents during the World War; that is, they were described as articles that would aid their enemy in the conduct of war and that, therefore, under international law, they could be confiscated or destroyed.

Then the Senator from Nevada goes on to say that the contraband lists already issued by Great Britain and Germany are so comprehensive that they include raw materials that the President now has the power to permit our vessels to carry to belligerents. The Senator points out that there is good reason to believe that the German Government "intends to pursue the same policy with regard to the submarining of neutral merchant vessels engaged in commerce with their enemy."

This being the case, the Senator brings in his carry provision as a safeguard against our being drawn into war through interference with our shipping. We must have his carry provision enacted into law, he says, because although he knows President Roosevelt "would not permit American vessels to be destroyed with the consequent loss of the lives of our American seamen if carrying of any goods to belligerents would develop such results," still no one can know, says the Senator, "what may be the sentiments, the prejudices, the

soundness of judgment of future Presidents." So he says we must adopt his new and mandatory carry provision first.

Mr. President, I entirely agree with the Senator's idea of the necessity for a mandatory provision. That idea is not new. Two years ago my colleagues and I were saying the same thing. As far back as 4 years ago, in Senate Joint Resolutions 99, 100, and 120—Seventy-fourth Congress, first session—we asked for restrictions on travel, an embargo on loans and credits, and a trade-at-your-own-risk law, plus the arms embargo.

Two years ago we asked for a cash-and-carry law that would be mandatory, a law whose application could not be left to the sentiments, the prejudices, the judgment of whoever occupied the White House, no matter who he might be. Some of us voted against the conference report because the cash-and-carry provision was discretionary rather than mandatory.

A mandatory cash-and-carry law did not have a chance then because the power of the occupant of the White House to use his own sentiments, prejudices, judgments in determining how and when restrictions on war trade should be applied was being zealously guarded at both ends of the Capitol. A mandatory neutrality law was impossible because at that time the discretion which the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] now characterizes as so vast and dangerous that it is unnecessary and unwise, was considered both necessary and wise by the very Senators who are now leading the fight for the Pittman measure of 1939.

By this time it is clear that the American people do not want any goods under American title to be shipped in American bottoms, because they know that when there is war in Europe, to all intents and purposes practically the entire ocean becomes a war zone; the broad stretches of the whole Atlantic, almost from New York to Cherbourg, become the theater of submarine warfare. The American people in their simplicity—which, thank God, is much more dependable as a guide than the sophistication that is all trimmed up in the legalistic ribbons and furbelows known as neutral rights—believe that the American citizen who dies for ostrich feathers is just as dead as the one who dies for dear old copper.

The attempt being made in pro-embargo-repeal quarters to circulate the idea that the choice now is cash and carry or the arms embargo, and that one must be for the one or the other, is disingenuous, to say the least—at least as disingenuous as the hoax of the "Cardiff giant" or that of Barnum's white elephant. I am for both provisions, and have been for both steadily since 1935. So have my colleagues who have fought for neutrality legislation since 1935. We are for the arms embargo, plus mandatory cash-and-carry provisions, plus keeping Americans off belligerent ships, plus a prohibition against allowing armed merchantmen, which are belligerent ships of war, to come into our ports as peaceful vessels. I am for all of those things, as those who have sat in this body from 1935 until today well know.

Practically every administration speech since this special session of Congress convened on September 21 has been an attempt completely to divorce those who advocate retaining the arms embargo from the carry provision. It is not actually said, but it is implied, that those of us who want to keep the arms embargo are not in favor of the carry provision. It is implied that those of us who stand for holding fast to the arms embargo are so blind that we cannot see the necessity for restricting shipments of materials other than munitions if we are to stay out of war.

The Senator from Nevada said over the radio the other night:

It is urged by the proponents of the Embargo Act that to sell arms, ammunition, and implements of war to belligerents is engaging in mass murder. Aren't we equally engaging in mass murder in Japan today by permitting to be shipped to Japan gasoline that runs their airplanes and scrap iron out of which they make their bombs with which to destroy the innocent population of China? Can anyone logically contend that oil and gasoline are not equally instruments of war with powder and other high explosives? And yet there is no prohibition against the export to any country, belligerent or not, of gasoline and scrap iron—in fact, of all the raw materials that I have named.

Mr. President, why is there not some restriction on shipments of materials to the Far East? I will tell you why. Not only did the President completely disregard the neutrality law with regard to the Far East and refuse to apply it, but administration forces failed to interest themselves 4 years ago, when it was proposed by myself and others, with the passage of legislation—Senate Joint Resolution 120, Seventy-fourth Congress, first session—to restrict sale and shipment on American boats of materials other than munitions.

The President, in his message to Congress on September 21, also implied that those who want to keep the arms embargo are not for a strong carry provision.

He said:

Let us be factual and recognize that a belligerent nation often needs wheat and lard and cotton for the survival of its population, just as much as it needs antiaircraft guns and antisubmarine depth charges. Let those who seek to retain the present embargo position be wholly consistent and seek new legislation to cut off cloth and copper and meat and wheat and a thousand other articles from all of the nations at war.

Mr. President, I refuse to wear the garment of short-sightedness with which the administration is seeking to clothe those of us who do not agree that the arms embargo should be lifted. I say that we were the first to urge congressional action to lessen the danger of our involvement in war through shipping goods to belligerents in American bottoms. We have never considered the arms embargo adequate without the carry provision.

In ordinary times I should not bother to remind the Senator from Nevada, and those with him who are seeking to remove the arms ban from the present neutrality law, that someone else worked for a mandatory cash-and-carry law before he put his stamp of approval on the idea.

But these are not ordinary times. What we decide in this Congress will be of such importance that it may make the difference between America staying out of war and America getting into war. It may make the difference between happiness and misery for millions of our fellow citizens.

So, when I see an attempt to beguile the American people into the belief that it is an "either or" proposition—either a strong carry law or the arms embargo, that the two are incompatible—and when I see that by so doing there is an attempt to throw over the embargo provision which we know from experience is an absolutely necessary safeguard if we are going to erect adequate bulwarks against involvement in war, I cannot keep silent. I must lift my voice in protest against any efforts on the part of anyone to enact a policy that in any degree increases our chances of getting into war.

Let us look at the record and see who initiated a demand for real cash-and-carry legislation.

So far as I can recall, the first bills on the subject were those introduced by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] and myself in the spring of 1935. On April 9, 1935, we introduced Senate Joint Resolution 100 to prohibit the extension of credits and the issuance of foreign loans to belligerents. That was the first measure introduced to establish the principle of cash on the barrel head and to put an end to the unholy system of World War days when we poured out loans and credits.

We also introduced on May 7, 1935, Senate Joint Resolution 120 to prohibit the export of arms and munitions of war to belligerents and to provide that articles declared to be conditional or unconditional contraband by any belligerent government shipped from the United States shall be shipped solely at the risk of the shipper or of a foreign government. It was provided in that resolution that after export from the United States "no American citizen, firm, partnership, or corporation shall retain any right, title, or interest in any such article of contraband."

That was the beginning of the attempt to see that goods shipped from the United States were shorn of their American connection so that American citizens need not have their emotions stirred to the point of demanding redress if the goods were sunk or captured. That was the introduction of the idea of trading at your own risk, the beginning of the carry idea.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Brown in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I am not sure whether or not the Senator requested not to be interrupted?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am very glad to yield to have the Senator interrupt me.

Mr. WHEELER. As I understood, a moment ago the Senator said that he or someone else proposed to offer amendments to the pending joint resolution so that the present embargo could be maintained, and we could also have cash and carry for things that did not come under the present embargo?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is entirely correct.

Mr. WHEELER. I am very glad to hear the Senator say that, because I have just had occasion to travel from one end of the country to the other, and the impression seems to prevail among a great many people that if we do not enact the pending measure, and have to go back to the present law, they can ship anything they want to under the present law.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I said before the Senator from Montana entered the Chamber that the attempt to make it appear that it is an "either or" proposition, that there is anything incompatible or antagonistic between the retention of the arms embargo and the insertion of a bona fide cash-and-carry provision, which the pending joint resolution does not contain, is the greatest hoax ever attempted to be perpetrated on the American people since the alleged discovery of the North Pole by the late Dr. Cook.

Mr. WHEELER. I am very thankful to the Senator, because there is no question at all that the sentiment has been created in the country that we have either got to take the pending measure or we have got to let our citizens ship anything they want in American bottoms.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I thank the Senator, and I will say to him that for that reason, at the risk of being very tedious, I am taking the trouble to go into detail into the history of the arms embargo and the cash-and-carry idea, to show that, so far as being incompatible, the two are essential, vital parts of a neutral program and that both should be included in the law, and those who have consistently struggled for neutrality legislation from the very beginning have always favored not only the arms embargo but cash and carry, and have also believed that each is incomplete and inadequate without the other.

Mr. President, from the time of the introduction of those resolutions in speeches and in writing we worked for adoption of that principle.

Writing in Harper's Magazine for December 1935, I said:

Why shall we contend for embargoes upon contraband articles as well and prohibition of loans and credits to belligerents? Because it takes these two items to complete any sort of workable neutrality program. If we are in earnest about neutrality, we may as well plan to be neutral.

Speaking at Carnegie Hall in New York City on May 27, 1935, I outlined the new neutrality legislation introduced by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Nye] and myself in the Senate and by Representative Maverick, of Texas, in the House as containing four vital provisions:

First. A complete embargo on the shipment of all arms and ammunition and other war material to all belligerents in time of war.

Second. A similar automatic embargo on all loans and credits to the warring nations for the purchase of war materials or other contraband.

Third. A law forbidding the granting of passports to American citizens traveling in war zones or on belligerent ships.

Fourth. A law requiring that anyone who exports any article declared to be contraband of war by any belligerent country shall do so at his own risk or at the risk of the foreign government or foreign purchaser.

This neutrality program, which was outlined in 1935, was, it is obvious, a cash-and-carry program.

Two Washington columnists who are now loudly maintaining that the arms embargo and a cash-and-carry provision are incompatible and antagonistic said in their column on July 25, 1935, in speaking of the resolution the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Nye] and I had introduced:

The heart of this act is that war commerce be put on a cash-and-carry basis. In other words, belligerents trading with the United States would have to take delivery of their goods at their own risk.

The Senator from North Dakota, speaking in Chattanooga, Tenn., on July 1, 1935, made a strong declaration for a ban on the issuance of loans and credits to any country at war.

An Associated Press dispatch from Washington of August 20, 1935, said that the threatened filibuster against the President's "must" program that did not originally include neutrality legislation would pave the way for proposals from the Munitions Committee Senators "that will serve notice that Americans traveling on ships of belligerents will do so at their own risk."

The Senator from North Dakota in August 1935 addressed a letter to Senator PITTMAN in which he called attention to the imperative necessity for prohibiting loans and credits to belligerents.

An Associated Press dispatch from Chicago on September 26, 1935, reported an interview with the Senator from North Dakota regarding the neutrality program he was sponsoring and pointed out that this proposal to put—

foreign buyers on a "pay cash and take goods away at your own risk" basis, would preclude the United States from being drawn into war by the sinking of ships or any other interference by warring nations with American goods intended for countries at war.

Again, in an Associated Press dispatch from Cedar Falls, Iowa, on October 3, 1935, the Senator from North Dakota is reported as saying:

It is fair to assume that enough people in this country are developing and will voice so firm a determination to stay out of another foreign war as will result in January action by Congress strengthening our neutrality policy to the extent of forbidding American loans and credits to nations engaged in war, of inaugurating a cash-and-carry policy that will forbid use of the American flag in undertaking delivery of contraband to nations at war, and of making permanent the existing provision on neutrality providing for mandatory rather than permissive enforcement of embargoes against munitions sales.

I am thus quoting in detail to demonstrate the fact that the cash-and-carry idea from the very beginning has been associated with the group which the President today admonishes to—

be wholly consistent and seek new legislation to cut off cloth and copper and meat and wheat and a thousand other articles from all of the nations at war.

Were the President and the Senator from Nevada in 1935 supporting neutrality legislation that even vaguely hinted at cash and carry? They were not. Not only did the administration in its proposed measure say nothing about prohibiting loans and credits or about demanding that shipment of materials be made at the risk of the owner or of a foreign government but the arms embargo provision was completely discretionary, leaving it to the President to decide what nations should be affected by our embargo—not all nations at war. So much for the 1935 concern of the administration for a law that was mandatory and embodies the cash-and-carry principle.

As enacted, the 1935 law prohibited the sale of munitions to nations at war when a state of war was declared by the President to exist; prohibited American vessels from carrying munitions destined for belligerents; and gave the President power to prohibit travel by American citizens on the vessels of belligerents, and control over the use of our ports by the submarines of a foreign nation in wartime. The law also provided for the establishment of a Munitions Control Board in the State Department, setting up machinery for giving the Government licensing power over exports of arms, ammunition, and implements of war. The Board, which was continued in subsequent legislation, is required to publish an annual report of all licenses issued. I propose to amend the provisions relative to this Board by adding two Members of the Senate and two Members of the House of Representatives.

What happened in 1936?

By the time Congress convened in January 1936, public opinion had expressed itself even more clearly in favor of strong neutrality legislation, so the administration bill moved over in some respects to meet the position of the group that spoke for the position of the people.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] in the Senate and Representative McReynolds in the House introduced the administration measures. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Nye] and I presented in the Senate a bill in behalf of the mandatory group, and Representative Maverick introduced a similar measure in the House.

This time the administration bill, as well as our bill, provided for a mandatory embargo on arms, ammunition, and implements of war, although ours was more mandatory, in that the embargo was to be applied automatically upon the outbreak of war, while the administration measure called for its application "upon the outbreak or during the progress of war."

When it came to trade in essential war materials, which in 1935 we had attempted to have restricted by providing that the shipper or receiver assume all risk, both the administration bill and ours recommended that shipments be restricted to a quota based on a previous average. The administration bill gave the President discretion to determine the period of years for "average" shipments, while our bill specified that the average be computed from shipments during the 5-year period preceding the outbreak of war. In some other respects our bill was stronger in this section than the administration bill.

Our bill had a real "carry" provision in section IV, in which American vessels were expressly prohibited from carrying arms, ammunition, or implements of war or any essential war materials in excess of quota to or for the use of belligerent states. The administration bill gave the President discretion to forbid American vessels to carry essential war materials, and empowered him to revoke his prohibition at any time.

Our provision that American vessels be prohibited from traversing waters adjacent to a belligerent state "which are also actually within the zone of belligerent operations" was not touched upon in the administration bill.

Our provision that "export by sea" of any article or commodity which can be reached only by traversing zones of belligerent operations should be "solely at the risk of a foreign government or national thereof" was watered down in the administration measure to a grant to the President of discretionary power to require that American citizens "assume the risk of commercial transactions with the governments or nationals of belligerent countries."

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. DOWNEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield for that purpose?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes; I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Clark, Mo.	Hill	Neely
Andrews	Connally	Holman	Norris
Austin	Danaher	Holt	Nye
Bailey	Davis	Hughes	O'Mahoney
Bankhead	Donahay	Johnson, Calif.	Overton
Barbour	Downey	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper
Barkley	Ellender	King	Pittman
Bilbo	Frazier	La Follette	Radcliffe
Borah	George	Lee	Reed
Bridges	Gerry	Lodge	Reynolds
Brown	Gibson	Lucas	Russell
Bulow	Gillette	Lundeen	Schwartz
Burke	Green	McCarran	Schwellenbach
Byrnes	Guffey	McKellar	Sheppard
Capper	Gurney	McNary	Shipstead
Caraway	Hale	Maloney	Slattery
Chandler	Harrison	Mead	Smathers
Chavez	Hatch	Minton	Stewart
Clark, Idaho	Herring	Murray	Taft

Thomas, Okla.
Thomas, Utah
Townsend

Truman
Tydings
Vandenberg

Van Nuys
Wagner
Wheeler

White
Wiley

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, when the absence of a quorum was suggested I was discussing the differences between the administration Neutrality Act of 1936 and the joint resolution introduced by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Nye] and myself on behalf of the mandatory group. I will continue with the comparison.

Where our joint resolution automatically prohibited travel by American citizens on belligerent vessels or other vessels traversing zones of belligerent operations, the administration bill required only that no American citizen should travel on any belligerent vessel "except at his own risk."

The provisions prohibiting sale of securities issued by belligerents were substantially the same in both measures.

As for credits, our measure required that the President prohibit the extension of commercial credits under authority of section V of the act of October 6, 1917. The administration measure permitted the President to exempt ordinary commercial credits and short-time obligations "of a character customarily used" in current commercial business.

The remainder of the provisions were similar on both bills.

It is clear that in proposing a neutrality measure in 1936 the administration was making some concession to the great demand for a mandatory law, and for a time it seemed that it would respond to the appeal of logic in working for some kind of cash-and-carry feature. But at the last minute the administration threw overboard the proposed bill, and the all-important question of controlling the export of war materials in addition to munitions was left untouched. The tremendous boom in American exports of scrap iron and steel, copper, gasoline, and other necessary secondary materials of war during 1936, 1937, and 1938, when the nations of the world, especially Japan, were stocking their shelves with war supplies, is adequate proof that the question should have been settled at the time of the 1936 revision of the neutrality legislation.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. PITTMAN. I realize that the Senator has a prepared speech which it will take him some time to deliver, and I do not desire to interrupt him now—

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am very glad to have the Senator interrupt at any time.

Mr. PITTMAN. I merely wish to say that whenever I have an opportunity I will state to the Senate some of the mistakes I think the Senator has made. I realize he does not make many mistakes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will listen with great interest to the exposition of the Senator from Nevada of my mistakes and will endeavor to the best of my ability to defend the propositions which I have stated.

Mr. PITTMAN. Of course, I know the Senator will not be offended at me if I suggest that he is human and can make mistakes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Not in the least. I shall be very glad to be corrected by the Senator from Nevada at any time.

Mr. PITTMAN. To call attention to just one of the many mistakes the Senator has made, with regard to travel on vessels under the 1937 law, I understood the Senator to say—

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I have not as yet come to a discussion of the act of 1937. I am still discussing the act of 1936. I shall come to the act of 1937 in a moment, if the Senator will possess himself in patience.

Mr. PITTMAN. I thought the Senator said people travel at their own risk, under the act of 1937.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. No; I have not come to that act.

Mr. PITTMAN. I did not know the act of 1935 had anything to do with that point.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I know it did not.

Mr. PITTMAN. Oh, the Senator is talking about what he intended to have enacted.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am comparing in every instance the measures as they were proposed by the mandatory group and as they were subsequently enacted.

Mr. PITTMAN. What I intended to do would take up too much time at the moment. When I will not be interfering with other speakers who are scheduled to address the Senate, I shall call attention to a few mistakes the Senator has made, both as to the bill he himself introduced, and as to the amendments for which he voted and the bills for which he voted; but there will be plenty of time for that.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will listen to the Senator with very great interest. If he can correct any errors of mine, I shall be glad to acknowledge them.

As finally approved the 1936 revision continued the provisions of the 1935 law and added to them a ban on the extension of loans or credits to belligerent nations. It also provided that the law should not apply to an American republic or republics engaged in war against a non-American state or states, provided that the American republic is not cooperating with a non-American state or states in such war. The 1936 law was also temporary legislation and expired on May 1, 1937.

We now come to the present law, enacted in 1937. I shall not take the time of the Senate to go through the 1937 law section by section and compare what the administration asked for and what we asked for. Suffice it to say that the 1937 law, in addition to imposing a mandatory embargo upon munitions and loans and credits and prohibition on American ships carrying arms to belligerents, prohibited travel by American citizens on belligerent vessels, prohibited the arming of American merchant vessels, and gave the President discretionary power to require the transfer of title in all or any goods shipped to belligerents, provided such provision applies to all nations engaged in war. The President was given power to list goods other than arms which American ships might not carry to belligerents. Over our objection these two discretionary provisions for control of trade were adopted for a 2-year period only. The law also gave the President power to restrict the use of our ports in wartime by foreign armed merchant vessels as well as submarines. The law applied to civil strife in the same general manner as in the case of international war. The exception of the American republics from the working of the act was continued with the same provisions as in the 1936 law.

There were grave omissions in that law, gaps so serious that to the very end of the debate some of us fought to close those gaps and voted against the conference report because we did not succeed. The bill provided no control over a wartime trade boom; it depended on Presidential discretion for transfer of ownership in goods shipped to belligerents; there was no assurance that American shipping would be kept out of war zones, because it was left up to the President.

Immediately after the inadequate measure was enacted into law, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], and myself introduced Senate bill 2370, amending the law to make the carry section mandatory instead of permissive. The legislation we proposed would have had the effect of requiring transfer of title in goods shipped to belligerents and keeping American ships from carrying cargoes to or for use of belligerents. But the administration at that time did not want a mandatory carry section and our bill went by the board.

When it came to 1939, with the discretionary section expiring, under which the President at his own will might ban American vessels from carrying such materials in addition to any arms, ammunition, and implements of war as he might name, and might prohibit their export until all American title or interest were transferred, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] again introduced a measure, as did the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], and I. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] introduced a separate resolution for continuing the cash-and-carry provision. Representative BLOOM's bill represented the point of view of the discretionary group in the

House and was generally considered to be the administration bill.

The resolution of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] ignored completely a specific ban on arms and munitions. Instead he chose to rely entirely on a cash—with modifications—and carry measure, thus leaving the way open for a repetition of the one-sided arms trade which helped involve us in 1917.

Instead of asking for a complete ban on loans and credits, he preferred to exempt normal short-term commercial credits at the President's discretion.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. PITTMAN. Was the Senator from Missouri opposed to that section in the original act?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I voted for the original act.

Mr. PITTMAN. The original act contains a proviso that the President may permit short-term credits.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am perfectly aware of that. I was not in favor of that.

Mr. PITTMAN. The Senator voted for the measure.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I voted for the bill. I voted against the conference report.

Mr. PITTMAN. Did the Senator offer any amendment to strike out that proviso?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I did not.

Mr. PITTMAN. Does not that proviso grant the President discretion to permit short-term credits?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. There is no question about that. I just stated that in the measure which the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], and I introduced no such authority was granted.

Mr. PITTMAN. The Senator did not offer any amendment on the floor to strike out the proviso?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. No.

Mr. President, our measure, if adopted, would have been a much stronger safeguard against involvement in war. Not only did we call for absolute prohibition of the transportation of any articles to belligerents on American ships, and not only did we demand that all American title and interest be given up before any article could be exported, provisions for which the Pittman bill provided, but we also included a flat prohibition on the export of arms, ammunition, and implements of war to belligerents. And we did not exempt even normal short-term credits.

But if I object to the Pittman 1939 measure as being inadequate in comparison with the bill my colleagues and I introduced in the Senate, the House measure, put before that august body by Representative BLOOM, the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Affairs committee, was a travesty.

Mr. President, I thought the original impulse for a neutrality law was to keep the country out of war, but that impulse was completely lost sight of in the so-called Bloom bill.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McKELLAR in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. FRAZIER. The Senator spoke of the original bill introduced by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs in the House, Representative BLOOM. Was not that commonly understood to be the administration bill?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It was generally so understood and so called. Representative Bloom introduced the bill, and his name was attached to it, but it was generally understood and considered as the administration bill.

Mr. President, in that measure, all previous restrictions on the sale of arms and war materials to belligerent nations were lifted. American ships were not banned from carrying materials to belligerents. The only protection against our involvement in war, through war trade, was a provision requiring transfer of title in all goods shipped to belligerents, and a provision giving the President discretionary power to designate areas of combat operations where our citizens and vessels may go only under limitations prescribed by him.

This, Mr. President, was the resolution for which the administration went down the line after 4 years of Nation-wide discussion and debate. This was the way the administration answered the cry of millions of Americans to take every possible safeguard to keep us out of war. So zealous was the administration to put that measure through the House that certain supporters tried to get a favorable committee vote for a rule which would have barred any amendment of it when it was brought up for consideration on the House floor. Luckily, the move was defeated, and it is now a matter of history how the arms embargo—with modifications—was kept in the House measure in spite of all attempts to abandon it.

Mr. President, I have trespassed upon the time of the Senate to sketch briefly the history of neutrality legislation in Congress since 1935 because I want to call attention to certain points which are so obvious it should be unnecessary to specify them.

The present law is as mandatory as it is because a group of Senators who passionately believe in real neutrality fought for it when the administration forces were doing everything in their power to retain discretion for the occupant of the White House. What mandatory features there are in the neutrality law today are the result of the indefatigable efforts of these men—not of the administration.

The fact that the Senator from Nevada today appeals for this proposed law on the ground that it is mandatory indicates how well we have done our work.

The whole emphasis of the administration spokesmen has been to have a law enacted which would give the President discretion to favor one side or the other in a dispute. It has only recently been turned in the direction of a mandatory law.

On August 23, 1935, Representative McReynolds put the case for discretionary legislation. He said in the House:

I do not approve of the mandatory provision of this bill, I am frank to say. I introduced a bill on August 17 which would give the President discretion The President of the United States has a greater responsibility to prevent war and to sustain peace than any of you, and I am always willing to leave it to that office when you put a mandatory provision in you absolutely destroy this country's efforts for peace, and you know it.

When Senators read the eloquent appeal of the Senator from Nevada for support of his measure on the ground that the carry feature is new, I ask them to look back over the history of neutrality legislation I have outlined for them today. I ask them to remember that as early as 1935 the mandatory group was asking for a trade-at-your-own-risk provision.

And remember that as late as the spring of 1939 the administration was strenuously trying to put through the Bloom bill, which ignored the necessity for a strong carry section.

I should like to point out to the Senate that the mandatory group is willing and anxious to go all the way in setting up safeguards against involvement in war, while the group for which the Senator from Nevada speaks will not go more than halfway.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. PITTMAN. Does the Senator contend that "trade at your own risk" is the same as making it unlawful to trade at all?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. By no means.

Mr. PITTMAN. Does the Senator consider it mandatory to say that a person may trade at his own risk?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. No; I do not say that at all.

Mr. PITTMAN. I understood the Senator to say that the provision he referred to with respect to "trading at your own risk" was mandatory.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. To which provision does the Senator refer?

Mr. PITTMAN. To the sentence the Senator just read; the "trade at your own risk" provision.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, there is no question about that.

Mr. PITTMAN. That is the provision the Senator had in his measure.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I do not contend that the "trade at your own risk" provision in the 1935 proposal was precisely the same as the present cash-and-carry proposal, but it is certainly the genesis for and the thing which led to the whole development of the cash-and-carry theory as afterward proposed by the same group in 1936.

Mr. PITTMAN. But I contend that "trading at your own risk" is not the same thing as a law making it unlawful to trade at all.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, as I understand, there has never been any suggestion to make it unlawful to trade at all, except in regard to arms, ammunition, and implements of war. Neither the cash and carry, or the credit and carry, or the "trade at your own risk," which is essentially in the same category, has ever had anything to do with making it unlawful to trade at all.

Mr. PITTMAN. What does the Senator refer to as "trade at your own risk"? I understand that is the suggestion the Senator and some of his group made—

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. In 1935.

Mr. PITTMAN. What does he mean by "trade at your own risk"?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Trade in anything with the belligerents.

Mr. PITTMAN. Now the Senator says we should not trade except by conveying title.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is simply a development of the same proposal.

Mr. PITTMAN. And now the Senator says that we cannot use an American ship at all to trade with nations.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Those were all successive developments. We originally urged the prohibition of trade in American bottoms. It was not actually included in any of the provisions of the 1935 and 1936 laws. Nevertheless, it was very much in controversy and discussion.

Mr. PITTMAN. The Senator voted for the 1937 act, did he not?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I voted for all such measures except the conference report on the 1937 act.

Mr. PITTMAN. And the Senator has explained why he did not vote for that report.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes; I have explained why.

Mr. PITTMAN. That was by reason of the House putting in one provision that we did not have in the Senate measure.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, it was by reason of the fact that the House and the conference report had, to a very large extent, emasculated the cash-and-carry provision by making it discretionary rather than mandatory, as I stated in my remarks against the conference report.

Mr. PITTMAN. Yes; and yet the Senator knows what that amendment was. It dealt only with subsection (a). The Senator voted for an amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], to strike out subsections (a), (c), and (d) and leave in subsection (b); and subsection (b) made it discretionary with the President as to whether or not he should include goods other than arms, ammunition, and implements of war.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, my position on the conference report was the same as was indicated by the Senator from Nevada himself, except that he voted for it and I voted against it. The Senator from Nevada stated that he had taken a position in the conference in which he had strongly adhered to the Senate provision, which was of a stronger mandatory character, but had been overwhelmed in conference, and had voted for the conference report. I took the position that the conference report weakened the measure and made it a very dangerous proposition. I therefore voted against it.

Mr. PITTMAN. I realize that fact. The Senator from Missouri voted for the measure, and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] voted against it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is correct.

Mr. PITTMAN. Then the House put in the discretionary clause to which the Senator from Missouri objected, and the

Senator from Missouri voted against the conference report, although the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] voted for it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is entirely correct.

Mr. PITTMAN. The RECORD at that time will disclose that that was the only amendment which was offered by any of the Senator's group.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I have not in mind the amendment to which the Senator refers. I read the debates on the conference report only yesterday. I am very certain what my position was on it, and I shall be very glad to have the Senator from Nevada refer to it at any time.

Mr. PITTMAN. Some time would be required to call attention to the various votes. I will say to the Senator that so far as I now know he had only one objection which I remember, and that is the one about which we are talking.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That was what I stated so very emphatically in my remarks.

Mr. PITTMAN. I shall bring out all the facts when I have time.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I know that the Senator is very familiar with what took place in the House with reference to the Bloom measure. As I understand, the Bloom measure in the House, which was an administration measure, contained a provision that—

Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under the authority of section 1 (a) it shall thereafter be unlawful to export, or attempt to export, or cause to be exported, arms or ammunition from any place in the United States to any belligerent states named in such proclamation.

Is that correct?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, that provision was inserted in the measure in the debate in the House after a very strenuous fight and over the last-ditch opposition of Representative BLOOM and the supporters of the so-called Bloom joint resolution as it was reported from the committee. After the efforts of the proponents of the original Bloom measure to adopt a gag rule shutting off any amendment had been defeated, and the joint resolution was brought into the House under the general rules of the House and open to amendment, the amendment which the Senator has just read, which was offered by Representative VORYS of Ohio, was adopted following a very desperate fight which restored that much of the provisions of the existing law to the Bloom resolution, and that provision was in the joint resolution as it came from the House to the Senate, but not as it was reported from the committee to the House.

Mr. WHEELER. So, as a matter of fact, what the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate has done is to take out the provision which passed the House.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes; that is entirely true.

Mr. President, we are asked by those who are attempting to repeal the arms embargo, Why do we need to ban arms exports if we are to have a strong carry provision? I will tell you why we must keep the arms embargo. In the first place, it keeps us from engaging in the bloody, unholy, immoral business of being an arsenal for death-dealing weapons, or dealing in instruments of death. Furthermore, Mr. President, it is necessary to keep the arms embargo to all belligerents, because the armaments trade is the one trade which depends most on war for profits. It is the one trade most calculated to bring about unhealthy, unwholesome, costly inflation, with all its attendant evils. We must keep the arms embargo, because we adopted the embargo on arms to all belligerents in 1935 and reenacted it in 1936 and 1937 as our national policy, as a strong protective measure to insure our peace; because we said we would not again become the arms arsenal for any nation or group of nations; because we did not want to permit the growth of a vested interest in the arms trade which would inevitably endanger the determination of the country to keep out of foreign war.

I submit that the strongest protection for our people against involvement in war will be afforded by a strong cash-and-carry law in addition to the absolute ban on the sale or shipment of arms, ammunition, and implements of war. To these

carry provisions should, of course, be added the other measure of protection to which I have previously referred.

Why be satisfied with anything less? Why is not the administration working to give the people the strongest possible protection against war?

We are either for taking every possible precaution against our involvement or we are against it. We cannot be half-way, because the minute we make a slight concession on the side of involvement, the minute we open the dikes even a fraction of an inch, we allow a trickle of forces that inevitably increases in volume until it becomes a raging torrent, battering down every safeguard we have erected.

Knowing that, I wonder if the President is trying to bargain with the Congress and the people. In his speech on the opening day of this special session of Congress he said:

With the repeal of the embargo this Government clearly and definitely will insist that American citizens and American ships keep away from the immediate perils of the actual zones of conflict.

What does he mean? Is he saying in effect that he, as President, is not willing to use his influence for the adoption of the strongest legislative bulwarks against war that can be evolved? Is he not saying, "You will have to take your choice between a cash-and-carry law and the arms embargo; you cannot have both"?

Why can we not have both? We need both if we are to stay out of war. We must take our ships out of war trade; we must see that no American has any interest whatever in materials en route to belligerents; we must withhold loans and credits from any belligerent, no matter how sympathetic we may be; we must refuse to be a base of supplies for any belligerent for arms, ammunition, and implements of war. We must close our ports to the armed merchantmen of belligerent nations. We must keep our citizens off belligerent ships. To this end I and those who believe as I do pledge our utmost endeavors to keep America out of war.

Mr. President, our present neutrality law, imperfect as it admittedly is, was the result of a general recognition of the direful consequences which had followed in the train of the policy of tragic futility which had finally caused us to be dragged into the last war. It was by general agreement an effort to take steps in advance to keep this country out of war, at a time when no suggestion of partiality could be charged against us, at a time when we could act without reference to any particular situation, because none then existed.

Let me emphasize the fact that the suggestion which has recently been made that our law was designed to prevent wars in Europe, and therefore that it has failed of its purpose, is buncombe pure and undefiled. No conception could have been more fantastic than that a domestic law of the United States could or would exercise a determinative effect upon power politics in Europe. No responsible spokesman ever made any such preposterous claim for the Neutrality Act. That act was a pronouncement of domestic policy for the government of our own citizens.

That act in its successive stages was enacted with one single purpose, universally understood throughout the country and repeatedly expressed by all connected with its enactment, from the President down. The purpose was this: That if, in spite of our ardent wishes for the maintenance of peace, war should unhappily break out abroad, we should have a law which would take immediate effect to safeguard us from drifting into that war as we did into the last war.

The present law was passed not in contemplation of a situation in which our good offices or our good example or our good wishes could possibly prevent war abroad, but in full contemplation of a situation in which, despite our wishes and despite anything we could do, war had again developed in the age-old game of power politics between any groups of belligerents. Precisely such a situation as the law was originally passed to deal with has now arisen.

Now, we hear from many quarters, including the highest, much talk about the ancient precepts of the law of nations, and many suggestions as to reliance on general international law.

But the enactment of the Neutrality Act was based upon the general recognition that international law had never had any

really binding effect upon any belligerent which chose to disregard it, and that, such as it was, it had practically disappeared during the World War. That was undoubtedly the basis of the Neutrality Act with the arms-embargo provision as its heart.

In appearing before the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate in January 1936, in behalf of the administration's bill, which became the Pittman bill of 1936, Secretary Hull said:

In the first place, the laws that gave us rights to the freedom of the seas were largely ignored during the war. They are rather quiescent now.

And again Secretary Hull said:

Now, it did not look wise or reasonable for us to announce a policy that a neutral nation shall supply belligerents with the materials which they say are indispensable to the prosecution of the war, under penalty of not being exactly neutral.

To us that seemed absurd and we said so. We could not see how a neutral could deliberately help to feed the fires and flames of war by delivering the essentials right straight to the belligerents, helping not only to carry on war but to prolong it indefinitely; and nobody knows much better than we that every day that war is prolonged the danger of the war spreading would be increased, with increased dangers to us of being involved.

And again the Secretary said:

Senator BORAH, today, in any war we do not have stable international law and order with respect to neutral rights.

And the Secretary pointed out the reason for the act, which included the arms embargo:

* * * We were seeking here to point out the purely negative way in which we would approach a war situation as a government acting separately, independently, and on its own initiative. The idea was to indicate that as a policy we think that any neutral nation is justified, unless it is to become a partner in the war, in refraining from aiding, directly, either belligerent in carrying on and in prolonging the war, for the reason that every day the war goes on the danger of our being drawn into it is increased, and the risk of spreading into a broader war is increased, and correspondingly the danger of our being drawn into it is again increased.

Apparently the Secretary in 1936 did not approve of aiding one set of belligerents "by measures short of war" about which we now hear so much.

In the same testimony, on the same measure, Assistant Secretary of State Moore backed up his chief in support of the Pittman bill of 1936. Testifying before the Committee on Foreign Relations, he said:

I do not see how you can expect to keep out of war if you are going to place your reliance on international law. Lord Salisbury said once, in a cynical way, "International law is what this or that writer says it is."

That is the situation at present. Laying aside international law as a means of protection, as something to which we ineffectively resort when we have some grievance and are trying to keep out of hostilities, we are endeavoring to enact domestic legislation here which will save us possibly, conceivably, from being drawn into a war.

Secretary Hull further said:

Our view was that from the standpoint of keeping out of the war, no nation has a right to go out and get into a war, no matter who is responsible for it, and then turn around to a friendly neutral and demand of it that it be furnished with the necessary war supplies to carry on the war under penalty of being unneutral.

The Secretary approved the arms embargo in the act of 1935 in the following words:

If that is true it must have some bearing on the action of Congress last August in enacting the Neutrality Act, which presumably was based upon the view that for this Nation largely to become the base of military supplies for any belligerent or belligerents would have a tendency to create an unneutral atmosphere and ultimately help to contribute to drag us into the war. We would therefore tighten up our neutrality by embargoing any shipment of any finished arms, ammunitions, and implements of war to any belligerent.

Secretary Hull said that in appearing in support of the Pittman bill of 1936.

Assistant Secretary Moore stated the true aim of the Neutrality Act when he said:

It is inescapable when you enact legislation that you may strike one adversary harder than you do the other. That is inescapable. But that is our right if we think it protects our real neutrality; that is to say, if it tends to keep us out of the conflict.

It was to that end that the arms-embargo provision was included in the acts of 1935, 1936, and 1937.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I gladly yield.

Mr. WHEELER. How does the Senator now account for the change of mind on the part of the distinguished gentleman to whom he has referred?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am unable to answer that question. I am certain that the status of international law has not changed in the slightest degree for the better since as recently as 2 or 3 years ago Secretary Hull, Assistant Secretary Moore, and Legal Advisor Hackworth, of the State Department, and my friend the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] all thought international law was played out.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] in an address at the University of Nevada May 8, 1937, in defending the Pittman Act of 1937, truthfully said:

They proclaim that we should rely upon international law—

About which we now hear so much—

They proclaim that we should rely upon international law. Well, there is no such thing as international law. * * * We will have our own restraining laws during war. We relied upon international law prior to the World War, and it was our undoing.

Most eloquent of all the expressions in connection with the Pittman Act of 1936, with its arms-embargo provision, was in the magnificent speech of President Roosevelt at Chautauqua, N. Y., on August 14, 1936, when he was appearing before the American people as a candidate for reelection and discussing the issues upon which he sought their favor. I have heretofore quoted that speech in this body and elsewhere, as have others. I expect to quote it again from time to time. To my mind, it cannot be quoted too often. I wish that every American might read it every day. In that great speech the President said:

It is clear that our present policy and the measures passed by the Congress would, in the event of a war on some other continent, reduce war profits which would otherwise accrue to American citizens. Industrial and agricultural production for a war market may give immense fortunes to a few men; for the Nation as a whole it produces disaster. It was the prospect of war profits that made our farmers in the West plow up prairie land that should never have been plowed, but should have been left for grazing cattle. Today we are reaping the harvest of those war profits in the dust storms which have devastated those war-plowed areas.

It was the prospect of war profits that caused the extension of monopoly and unjustified expansion of industry and a price level so high that the normal relationship between debtor and creditor was destroyed.

Nevertheless—

Said the President—

If war should break out again in another continent, let us not blink the fact that we would find in this country thousands of Americans who, seeking immediate riches—fools' gold—would attempt to break down or evade our neutrality.

That condition which the President predicted 3 years ago has actually come to pass in the United States of America today under the pressure for the repeal of the arms embargo. Certainly nobody would deny that that prophecy has come true.

The President continued:

They would tell you—and, unfortunately, their views would get wide publicity—that if they could produce and ship this and that and the other article to belligerent nations, the unemployed of America would all find work.

I recurred in thought to that noble statement as I listened to the message of the President on September 21, with the emphasis that he himself placed upon the exportation of arms as a profit motive be considered by the American people.

The President continued:

They tell you that if they could extend credit to warring nations that credit would be used in the United States to build homes and factories and pay our debts. They would tell you that America once more would capture the trade of the world.

That is what we are hearing today over the radio and in the newspapers and in public bodies in this country. The President continued:

It would be hard to resist that clamor.

None of us would deny that it has become hard to resist it.

The President continued:

It would be hard for many Americans, I fear, to look beyond—to realize the inevitable penalties, the inevitable day of reckoning that comes from a false prosperity. To resist the clamor of that greed, if war should come, would require the unswerving support of all Americans who love peace.

If we face the choice of profits or peace, the Nation will answer, must answer, "We choose peace." It is the duty of all of us to encourage such a body of public opinion in this country that the answer will be clear and for all practical purposes unanimous.

With that wise and experienced man who is our Secretary of State, whose statesmanship has met with such wide approval, I have thought and worked long and hard on the problem of keeping the United States at peace. But all the wisdom of America is not to be found in the White House or in the Department of State; we need the meditation, the prayer, and the positive support of the people of America who go along with us in seeking peace.

No matter how well we are supported by neutrality legislation, we must remember that no laws can be provided to cover every contingency, for it is impossible to imagine how every future event may shape itself. In spite of every possible forethought, international relations involve of necessity a vast uncharted area. In that area safe sailing will depend on the knowledge and the experience and the wisdom of those who direct our foreign policy. Peace will depend on their day-to-day decisions.

At this late date, with the wisdom which is so easy after the event and so difficult before the event, we find it possible to trace the tragic series of small decisions which led Europe into the Great War of 1914 and eventually engulfed us and many other nations.

It was with such considerations in mind that the Congress had in 1935 and 1936 enacted the first two Pittman measures containing the arms embargo. It was with such considerations in mind that the Congress in 1937 passed and the President signed the Pittman measure of 1937, containing both the arms embargo and the cash-and-carry provision, not as alternative or antagonistic provisions, but as parts of a harmonious whole.

Now, Mr. President, we suddenly encounter the suggestion that the provisions of our existing neutrality law must be repealed because it is itself contrary to international law, which we were advised by our greatest experts 3 years ago has passed out of existence. In the majority report of the Senate committee, in a passage notable and memorable because of the condensation of so many errors within so narrow a space, it is said:

The committee is of the opinion that the United States cannot maintain its neutrality so long as such embargo provisions remain upon our statute books. It is contrary to the accepted precepts of international law which prescribe that any belligerent may purchase any articles or materials in any neutral country. Belligerents as well as neutrals have relied from time immemorial upon this law. It has for hundreds of years been recognized by both belligerents and neutrals to govern their conduct toward each other, and is today so recognized by the governments of the world with the exception of the United States.

The assertion that an arms embargo is contrary to the accepted precepts of international law which prescribe that any belligerent may purchase any articles or materials in any neutral country is simply not borne out by the facts.

Many leading authorities on international law have expressly repudiated any such doctrine. I shall quote from only a few.

Prof. Edward S. Corwin, of Princeton University, in a letter to the New York Times of October 2, 1939, in writing of the President's message, furnishes at the same time complete refutation of the committee's statement. I shall quote at this time but the one paragraph bearing upon the committee's contention as to international law, but I ask unanimous consent that Professor Corwin's letter may be printed in full in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Apropos of the committee's view of international law, I quote the following from Dr. Corwin:

The fact is that the foregoing argument rests on a mistaken assumption, namely, that neutrals are under a positive obligation to trade with belligerents. The international law to which the President constantly appeals knows no such rule. That law merely permits neutrals to trade with belligerents, subject to the hazards to which the rules concerning contraband and blockade give rise; it no more requires neutrals to sell to belligerents than it requires them to produce for belligerents. The President's argument sub-

jects neutral interests to an utterly unheard-of servitude in favor of belligerents, and at the same time quite gratuitously presents the naval powers with a grievance made up out of whole cloth.

This concise statement of the law by a recognized authority is backed up by pronouncements of the most eminent international lawyers of the country.

Said John Bassett Moore:

There are already various countries which in accordance with their laws impose such a ban (arms embargo against all belligerents). This is entirely proper under international law.—Letter to Representative FISH, March 27, 1933.

Said Prof. P. C. Jessup, of Columbia University, another very eminent authority on international law:

There is nothing novel in a neutral assuming the duty, not imposed by international law, of prohibiting its nationals from engaging in the contraband trade. (American Journal of International Law, October 1935.)

Said Prof. E. M. Borchard, of Yale University, another very eminent authority:

The free and unrestricted supply of arms to all belligerents by neutral citizens is not illegal. * * * On the other hand, some countries * * * have by statute prohibited the export of arms in time of war. (American Journal of International Law, April 1933.)

Judge Manley O. Hudson, of the World Court, formerly professor of international law at Harvard University, and Professor Jessup, in a joint article, said:

National practice * * * has not been consistent. * * * A neutral cannot be charged with illegal conduct if it forbids under local penalties the traffic in contraband. (American Journal of International Law Supplement, July 1939.)

These authorities show that the Senate committee's majority report takes a position which is novel and unwarranted under the international law, for which they profess so much respect.

The committee's statement also ignores the record of what neutral countries have actually done in time of war. Listed below are no less than 44 countries which have at one time or another laid embargoes during the course of a war in their own national interest, and to protect their own neutrality. These embargoes show that the United States is taking a position which, under international law and actual precedent, it has every right to take.

The Neutrality Act is not an abnormal departure from the usual practice of neutrality. It is not contrary to the normal practice followed by all other states to embargo arms, ammunition, and implements of war. There is no absolute right under international law, or any other law, to carry on a munitions trade.

In fact, neutral prohibition of the export of arms and ammunition has a long history. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries countries often made treaties promising not to export arms to each others' enemies. Later they frequently laid embargoes. The list of embargoes by neutral countries includes Austria-Hungary, Belgium, Brazil, Bremen, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, El Salvador, Finland, France, Great Britain, Hamburg, Hanover, Honduras, Italy, Japan, Liberia, Lubeck, Mecklenburg-Schwerin, the Netherlands, Norway, Oldenburg, Panama, Papal States, Paraguay, Peru, Portugal, Prussia, Russia, Sardinia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Tuscany, two Sicilies, United States, Uruguay, Venezuela, Venice, and Yugoslavia—American Journal of International Law, section 2, volume 33, No. 3.

With certain countries it was a settled policy during the nineteenth century to prohibit the export of arms and ammunition. These countries include Austria-Hungary, Brazil, Chile, China, Colombia, Denmark, the Netherlands, Norway, and Sweden—American Journal of International Law, section 2, volume 33, No. 3.

Faced with such a list, how can anyone say that our arms embargo constitutes an abnormal departure from the usual practice of neutrality? Some of the most determined and successful neutrals—Denmark, Norway, and Sweden—have followed this course from the days of the armed neutrality of our own Revolutionary War.

In the World War many neutral nations embargoed arms and munitions. These included Brazil, China, Denmark, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Spain, and Sweden—United States, Foreign Relations, 1915, Supplement 804. Of these, all except Italy and Spain were following a practice that was common or customary with them. The nations that were practically in the combat area, such as the Scandinavians and the Dutch, who were vulnerable to attack or pressure by both Great Britain and Germany, had, of course, a special incentive to lay an embargo in order to forestall belligerent interference. Those embargoes undoubtedly helped to keep them at peace when all their neighbors were at war. Though the United States in 1914 and 1915 refused to lay an embargo, President Wilson became so exasperated with the Allies in the summer of 1916 that he seriously considered a retaliatory embargo upon exports—Munitions Investigation, Exhibit No. 2536. Even the United States, then, has not always considered an embargo an abnormal departure from the usual practice of neutrality; and some other countries, whose success as neutrals we may well envy, have followed the practice of embargoing arms and munitions of war.

Leading authorities, like John Bassett Moore, Philip C. Jessup, Edwin M. Borchard, Manley O. Hudson, and Edward S. Corwin, as we have seen, declare that it is entirely proper for nations to prohibit the export of arms. The Harvard Research on Neutrality, the latest publication in the field, goes even further and lends weight to the proposition that in the future it may become a neutral duty to prohibit such export. See article 11, A. J. I. L., section 2, volume 33, No. 3.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks certain extracts from the report to which I have just referred, and also a letter dated September 20, 1939, which appeared in the New York Times, written jointly by Professor Jessup and Prof. Charles Cheney Hyde, of Columbia University.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit B.)

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Furthermore, Mr. President, let us always remember that there is no absolute right under international law to ship munitions. A neutral government is of course forbidden to do it, and if a neutral individual engages in such a contraband trade, he does so without the protection of his government. His goods may be seized at sea and condemned at any time by a belligerent. As John Bassett Moore points out in *International Law and Some Current Illusions*, the contraband trade is not lawful in international law, since it is punishable by confiscation. (Op. Cit. 41-47.)

The present arms embargo was a piece of national legislation with the purpose, as Secretary Hull declared in 1936, of keeping us out of war. As we have seen, it was not concerned with international law, for international law has nothing to do with arms, ammunition, or implements of war until they are shipped out of a neutral country. So long as goods are within our jurisdiction they are not the subjects of international law. If we refuse to sell to all nations, no nation can complain that we are interfering with its rights.

As a matter of fact, Mr. President, all of us who participated in the enactment of the legislation will recall, and the recorded expressions of some of the leading actors bear witness, that in all of the discussions of the 1935, 1936, and 1937 neutrality acts, the arms-embargo section was almost unanimously assumed to be desirable, and because of that almost universal approval the arms-embargo provision was less discussed and less controversial than any other section of the bill. Nearly all of those who opposed or questioned other sections gave wholehearted support to the arms embargo.

To this effect we have the authoritative testimony of the Senator from Nevada, the chairman of the committee, when in the issue of the magazine *Today*, under date of February 1, 1936, in an article entitled, "Let's Not Wait for Peace," in discussing his proposed neutrality bill of 1936 (S. 3474) he wrote:

I have had the opportunity to read some severe criticisms of the proposed act. In none of these criticisms have I discovered any opposition to the embargo upon arms, ammunition, and implements of war. In fact, most of these critics approve such embargo.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I have been interested to find whence the demand is coming, in view of the statement just mentioned, for the repeal of the arms embargo. I have not been able to find any demand coming from the people. I have seen the demand in some of the articles of the columnists and in some newspapers, but I have failed to find among the rank and file of the people, among the farmers, the merchants, or any other class, any demand for repeal, and I was wondering whence it came.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, my observation and experience have been precisely the same as those of the Senator. I have observed the demand either coming from the newspapers, or from a few altruists who are sincerely of the opinion that we should engage on the side of certain belligerents; and the demand from the President of the United States.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield gladly.

Mr. DOWNEY. For the sake of the record, I should like to add this comment, that at least four out of five of the communications from California are against the sale of war materials to Europe. It may very well be that there is some propaganda which produces those letters against lifting the embargo, but what is interesting to me is that the number of letters or communications asking that the embargo be lifted is almost negligible. In other words, in the last month there have been almost no telegrams or letters coming in asking that such action be taken, and of those which do come I suppose four out of five are traceable to two or three great industries in California which would profit by the war, or certain minority groups whose interests in Europe are particularly affected. Outside of that, the communications from California for lifting of the embargo are almost nonexistent.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I agree with what the Senator has said, and I will say to him that my experience has been precisely the same as his. To demonstrate that, I took all the letters and all the postal cards and all the telegrams I received, piled them on two or three tables in my office, and told the newspapermen and all others that they were at perfect liberty to go in and look through them for themselves, and to quote any of them, so long as they did not quote the name or address of a man who had written a letter, because I did not think that was fair to those who wrote the letters.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I have received a few letters from persons who say to me that they want the embargo repealed because they want to see this country go in and help England and France; they feel we ought to get into the war in order to save the British Empire. My sympathies are with England and with France, but I do not want our country to get into war in order to save the British Empire, and I do not think it is necessary.

I came in contact with some British subjects who live just across the border from Montana who were urging and insisting that we should repeal the embargo, but I have failed to find any laboring people who realize that if there should be war they would have to do the fighting asking for the repeal of the embargo law.

Mr. LUNDEEN and Mr. BURKE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield first to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. LUNDEEN. If the Senator will permit, I can testify concerning the volume of correspondence along the line of the remarks of the Senator from Missouri on that subject.

Mr. President, this thought occurs to me: The distinguished Senator from Missouri is delivering an able and learned argu-

ment, presenting the reasons why we should maintain the embargo on arms, ammunition, and implements of war; but how can anyone, no matter how able and learned his argument may be, satisfy those who maintain that we must help Great Britain and France? That simply cannot be done.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I do not expect to be able to convince Senators or others who adhere to that view. I yield now to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. President, I was interested in the comment of the Senator from Montana that he had heard of no demand by labor that the arms embargo be repealed. Did the newspapers of the country report incorrectly the action of the American Federation of Labor, which met during the past week at Cincinnati, in which meeting there was a very definite demand expressed for the repeal of the arms embargo?

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield to me to answer the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I saw an article in which it appeared that the C. I. O. stated yesterday that they were going to support the President, and they made the statement because they did not know anything about the matter. I appreciate that some of the labor leaders of this country who are dominated by some of those connected with the administration will do anything they want them to do, but I am speaking of the rank and file of the laboring men of the Nation, and I say that, whether they are of the C. I. O. or the American Federation of Labor, or to whatever group they may belong, they have made no demand for the repeal of the embargo; and if the Senator will consult the rank and file of the laboring people he will find that they are unalterably opposed to our taking a single step that will lead down the road to war.

Mr. BURKE. Of course, we all agree—

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I do not wish to be discourteous to the Senator from Nebraska. At the same time, I do not want him to make a speech in my time, because I have quite a lengthy speech to make, and have been on the floor now for two hours and a half. The Senator from Nebraska is to follow me, I understand, at the conclusion of my remarks, and he can make his speech in his own time.

Mr. BURKE. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will yield; but I am anxious to proceed with my own argument, rather than have a collateral argument between the Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from Montana.

Mr. BURKE. Will the Senator yield to me to comment on the statement of the Senator from Montana to the effect that there is no demand from labor for repeal?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator can answer the Senator from Montana in his own time; I do not desire to have him make a speech in my time.

Mr. BURKE. If the Senator declines to yield—

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do decline now, because the Senator from Nebraska has notified me that he will take the floor in his own time as soon as I conclude, and he can make his argument in his own time.

Mr. BURKE. Very well.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I desire to proceed with the quotation from the article in the magazine *Today*, an article written by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], in which he further said:

It is charged that the bill aids the strong and penalizes the weak. Any exports to belligerent countries during a war must have this effect. The belligerent, or belligerents, having control of the seas will prevent any exports reaching the belligerents weaker upon the sea. How do we injure the weaker, therefore, by permitting fewer exports to all of the belligerents? We sympathize with the weak, but it is better for us that they suffer than that our citizens be dragged into war unnecessarily. We are seeking primarily to keep our citizens out of war, and in this effort we cannot be deterred by the effect of our domestic action upon any belligerent.

I contrast this with the explanation of the pending joint resolution given by the Senator from Nevada a few days ago. He concluded his article:

The act provides that we must treat all belligerents alike. Nothing could be more neutral.

My distinguished friend the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] acquiesced in this view in a colloquy with Judge Hackworth, the legal adviser of the State Department.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, would the Senator object to my suggesting the absence of a quorum?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If the Senator will wait until I conclude reading this colloquy, I shall be very glad to have him do so.

At page 293 of the hearings before the Foreign Relations Committee on the Pittman bill of 1936, we find this interesting conversation:

Mr. HACKWORTH. Senator, if you see two men fighting in the street and you have a store nearby, and in that store you are selling firearms, you are not taking a part in that fight if you refuse to sell your firearms to those men who are fighting.

Senator CONNALLY. We have agreed on that. Everyone is in favor of cutting off the exportation of firearms.

Mr. HACKWORTH. Yes.

Senator CONNALLY. That is recognized to be just and proper.

To the same effect was the expression of the splendid and able senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. At page 130 of those 1936 hearings the following colloquy took place:

The CHAIRMAN. Knowing that arms, ammunition, and implements of war are going to the power that controls the seas, as they did during the World War, you would not object to restricting the exportation to a belligerent of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, do you?

Senator GEORGE. No. I think that stands on a somewhat different footing.

These are simply evidences of the well-nigh universal chorus of approval which accompanied the enactment of the mandatory arms-embargo provision.

I shall be glad now to yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. DOWNEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUCAS in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Danaher	Johnson, Colo.	Reed
Andrews	Davis	King	Reynolds
Austin	Donahay	La Follette	Russell
Bailey	Downey	Lee	Schwartz
Bankhead	Ellender	Lodge	Schwellenbach
Barbour	Frazier	Lucas	Sheppard
Barkley	George	Lundeen	Shipstead
Bilbo	Gerry	McCarran	Slattery
Borah	Gibson	McKellar	Smathers
Bridges	Gillette	McNary	Stewart
Brown	Green	Maloney	Taft
Bulow	Guffey	Mead	Thomas, Okla.
Burke	Gurney	Minton	Thomas, Utah
Byrd	Hale	Murray	Townsend
Byrnes	Harrison	Neely	Truman
Capper	Hatch	Norris	Tydings
Caraway	Herring	Nye	Vandenberg
Chandler	Hill	O'Mahoney	Van Nuys
Chavez	Holman	Overton	Wagner
Clark, Idaho	Holt	Pepper	Wheeler
Clark, Mo.	Hughes	Pittman	White
Connally	Johnson, Calif.	Radcliffe	Wiley

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, the heart of this controversy is the question whether or not the mandatory arms embargo shall be repealed in an effort to help Great Britain and France, or whether we shall adhere to the policy three times solemnly enacted by Congress and approved by the President of protecting the interests of our own Nation by remaining austere aloof from the quarrels of other countries, no matter where the essential sympathies of our people may lie in such quarrels.

On the one side is the proposition that we shall adhere to the rules which we deliberately and dispassionately set up without reference to any particular situation for the prevention of our own involvement in any foreign entanglements. On the other side is the proposition that out of sympathy with the Empires of Great Britain and France—for empires they both are when their imperial colonial possessions are considered—we shall violate our own neutrality policy, and change the rules while the game is in progress for the unequal purpose of aiding one set of belligerents as against another.

On the one hand are those who believe that we can "eat our cake and keep it too," that we can actively aid Great Britain and France by measures short of war, and still avoid ultimate participation in the struggle. On the other side are those of us who believe that the relaxation of our policy of strict neutrality by the repeal of the arms embargo, and the establishment of the United States as a reservoir for slaughterhouse weapons is only the first step which must inevitably lead to war.

Let us be frank. We, who sit in this body, certainly owe that much to the American people whose most sacred interests we are passing upon today. Let us face the issue fairly and frankly as to where our duty and where our interest and where our obligation to our own institutions and our own posterity actually lie.

There are, in this country, perfectly honorable and patriotic men and women who conceive that our interests are so inextricably interwoven with those of Great Britain and France and Poland that we should step forward openly and frankly as a partner and ally. They agreed with the blunt declaration made only a few weeks ago, by Foreign Minister George Bonnet of France, that it is the duty of the United States to come forward boldly and announce that in the event of war we would be found fighting with all our men and all our resources on the side of Great Britain, France, and Poland. Now that the catastrophe of war has occurred, they would have the United States proceed without delay to take its place in the struggle on the side of those Allies. With regard to neutrality, they echo with enthusiasm the frank and candid words of the able and erudite Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], one of the authors of the committee substitute, when he said, in a recent radio address:

Let us give up this dream of impartiality, therefore of neutrality. It is better to take sides and fight.

With such a view I am in passionate disagreement, and I believe that the American people when they completely understand the issue will be in overwhelming disagreement. But, Mr. President, while I violently and completely dissent from the judgment, I respect such opinions when openly and candidly expressed.

Mr. President, if I believed for one moment that "the American frontier is on the Rhine," or that the "American frontier is the Maginot line," or that "our first line of defense is the British Navy"; if I believed for one moment, sir, that the British and French are fighting our battle, that they are in effect defending our shores from foreign attack, that their unhappy and persistent pursuit of the game of power politics in Europe makes them the guardians of the safety of the United States; then, as an American Senator and an American citizen, I would scorn the idea of casting a vote for either the arms embargo, or the cash and carry, or the credit and carry, or any other scheme which would make us a huckster of munitions and vital supplies to the saviors who were fighting our battles to preserve our liberties. Tragic as the choice would be to me, if I entertained any such belief, I would unhesitatingly vote for a declaration of war, and I would do so with the full knowledge that the initial requests for supplies would soon be followed by demands for loans and credits, and then by demands for our manpower, the "men over 13"—as the War Department draft scheme puts it—the lads with the bayonets, the boys to man the heavy guns, to fly the new planes on foreign fields—the oncoming boys who are the heart and hope of America. If I believed that the safety of this Nation or the safety of our institutions was involved in this power struggle in Europe, if I believed that Britain and France were fighting to protect us, I would regard the cash and carry or the credit and carry as no more honorable than hiring a substitute for military service. I would regard it as a national stultification, a national infamy. In such a case I would vote for war and be glad myself to march again and to see my boys march as they became old enough. I would vote for war even though I knew full well that such a declaration would put in pawn here at home the dearest of our liberties; that under such schemes as the Army mobilization plan and such agencies as

the Morgan-controlled National Resources Board, now temporarily suspended, a dictatorship with totalitarian powers would immediately be set up in this country; and that the rights which had been put in pawn might never be redeemed.

But, Mr. President, I entertain no such view. I adhere to the opinion that the greatest service the United States can possibly render to democracy in the world is to preserve democracy in the United States of America. I not only do not believe that it is our duty, but I think it would be suicidal for us to undertake—not only this year, but every 25 or 30 years—to protect the world-flung colonial empires of France and Great Britain.

At the outbreak of the World War the great Woodrow Wilson said:

The United States must be neutral in fact as well as in name during these days that are to try men's souls. We must be impartial in thought as well as in action. * * *

President Roosevelt has truly said that this is impossible, as was proved in the World War. Americans will always have their sympathies, and no law or proclamation will prevent them from entertaining them; but wise laws may prevent us from involvement in alien struggles.

For myself I abhor the hideous conceptions of nazi-ism, fascism, and communism—all ideas utterly alien and repugnant to our whole scheme of government and decency and life. I abhor Hitler. I abhor his bestial treatment of the Jews and his brutal and inhuman treatment of the Christians of Germany—that nation where valiant battles for religious toleration were once waged on so many fields. I despise Hitler and all his bestial ilk. But I despise little less those Tory statesmen of Great Britain and France who by their ruthless policies in disregarding the provisions of the Versailles Treaty as to their own disarmament, and by their economic oppression of Germany, deliberately broke down the liberal government established in Germany under the Weimar Constitution—a constitution in many respects more liberal than our own—and threw Germany into the arms of the unspeakable Hitler. That liberalism in Germany failed, that the efforts of even such moderate liberals but great constructive statesmen as Stresemann and Brüning were overwhelmed, and that Germany was thrown into the arms of Hitler and his gang of thugs and bandits, is a responsibility which must rest upon that group of callous, cold-hearted statesmen who controlled the destinies of France and Great Britain and of all their Balkan and eastern European allies—the heroes of Munich, the partners and accomplices of Hitler and Mussolini in the rape of Czechoslovakia, the only bona fide democracy in Europe.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. REED. I do not want the able Senator from Missouri to leave that point without asking him a question.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I shall be glad to have the Senator ask me a question.

Mr. REED. As I gather from the Senator's remarks, he does not believe that the present war in Europe is a war between democracies and dictatorships, but is a war over the balance of power in Europe. Is not that correct?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I think it is like every other war that has been fought in Europe in the past 200 years. It is a fight over power politics and boundaries.

Mr. REED. I wish to say to the Senator from Missouri that if that is his opinion as to the basis of the present war in Europe, I am in entire agreement with him.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I think the whole history of modern times demonstrates that to be a fact.

Besides those who openly favor the proposition of "taking sides and fighting," as the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] put it, there is another group in the country which takes the position that our involvement in the struggle is ultimately inevitable, and that we should now resign ourselves to that end and prepare for the submersion of our whole economic system and our institutions of government in that sea of blood.

This position is utterly unsound, because it is based upon wholly false premises in its assumption that there is no way in which the United States can stay out of the struggle, even if it wants to do so and is willing to make the necessary sacrifice to do so.

More dangerous, because more subtle and more appealing to many persons, is the view that we may or may not be able to stay out of the war, but that in the meantime we should pursue a mercenary course, make every penny we can out of the conflict, indulge in "measures short of war," and let nature take its course.

This way leads to spurious prosperity, to sudden illusory fortunes, to enormous profits to the munition makers and warmongers, to speculative riches, and to all that dread aftermath of enormous taxes, black depression, and impairment in governmental processes and civil liberties which followed in the train of the last war.

Mr. President, the tear-rusted, bloodstained gold that we got from the munitions trade in the last war has never been anything but a curse to us. The inflation and depression which followed, the present depression and situation of the United States following that inflation and depression, with millions of Americans out of employment, with \$14,000,000,000 owed us from abroad that we shall never get, and the serious impairment of our political and governmental processes as a result of that war, bear witness to that fact.

Moreover, Mr. President, that course leads as surely to war as if we were today to declare war and range ourselves upon the side of one set of belligerents on Europe's far-flung battle line, which would probably in the long run be a cheaper and more honorable course than pursuing our mad search of war profits until the inflation of munitions production had brought about a financial and economic situation which dragged us in, as happened in the last war.

As against these various views is the position of that great body of our people who desire to stay out of war, who are willing to make some sacrifices of profits in order to stay out, and who will not, I am persuaded, be misled or seduced by the propaganda for taking us into the conflict which is already in full sweep.

I believe the overwhelming majority of our people desire to stay out of war. I believe we can stay out of war if we understand what we are doing and are willing to pay the price for peace. That price involves the loss of temporary profits in the sale of the instruments of death; but it will be far, far cheaper in the long run than our involvement in war.

Mr. President, during the last war it was strongly contended by Great Britain and her Allies that for a power to change its neutrality laws after the war had started was in itself a breach of neutrality—indeed, an unneutral act. Our Government completely, emphatically, and repeatedly endorsed that position as to international law. In a letter to the German Ambassador in April 1915 the American Government stated its position:

This Government holds, as I believe your excellency is aware and it is constrained to hold in view of the present indisputable doctrines of accepted international law, that any change in its laws of neutrality during the progress of a war which would affect unequally the relations of the United States with the nations at war would be an unjustifiable departure from the principle of strict neutrality by which it has consistently sought to direct its action.

Later President Wilson, in commenting on a demand from Austria-Hungary that we check our munitions trade in the interest of strict neutrality, wrote to Secretary Lansing that we—

are absolutely unanswerable in our position that these things cannot be done while a war is in progress and against the parties to it.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President—

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will yield in a moment. Mr. President, it has been suggested in this debate that there is an inconsistency in the position which we take that to repeal the arms embargo would be an unneutral act as a change of the rules "while the game is in progress" and being willing at the same time to support the cash and carry and certain other provisions of the joint resolution. There

is no inconsistency at all, because, as is abundantly shown in the citations from Professor Jessup, Professor Hyde, and some of the others, which I have obtained permission to print in the RECORD, the rule has always been that, while a nation cannot, after war has developed, change its position as to neutrality in the way of relaxing its neutrality provisions, it always has a right to pass additional safeguards for tightening and strengthening its neutrality policy to keep itself out of war. Cash and carry and the other provisions which we have announced we were willing to support are in the interest of strengthening and tightening our neutrality policy, while the repeal of the arms embargo would be precisely in the other direction.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. Is it not fair to say that the important thing is not whether the rules are changed in the middle of the game, but whether something is done which changes the balance of power?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is unquestionably true.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. FRAZIER. I was very much interested in what the Senator said about the attitude of our Government during the World War on the particular question of the change of the rules, and that the Congress itself rejected a proposal of that kind and refused to adopt it because it would change the rules at the time. On the other hand, we are now asked to change the rules, and we are told at the same time by the same people that there is no danger of getting into war. In the World War they refused to change the rules and got into the war, and now they ask us to change the rules and yet tell us there is no danger of getting into war.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I call the Senator's attention to the fact—which is, perhaps, a complete answer to the anomaly to which he has just referred—that in the World War Great Britain objected to our changing the rules, and said it would be an unneutral act, whereas now Great Britain wants us to change the rules and says it would not be an unneutral act.

Mr. President, I rejoiced, in common with the overwhelming majority of the American people, in the explicit declarations of the President in his message of September 21 in announcing his rigid determination to prevent the United States from being drawn into the conflict abroad. Those of us who most strongly disagree with the method proposed by the President, namely, the repeal of the arms embargo, are most ardent in support of his announced position of keeping this Nation from the war. We will support that determination in every possible way.

But, Mr. President, I cannot view without grave misgiving some of the things of a warlike nature which have already taken place at a time when we do not even have a serious diplomatic dispute with any other nation in the world.

In the first place, the proclamation of the President, which has been widely heralded as a proclamation of limited national emergency, is no such thing. Upon careful scrutiny it will bear no such interpretation. It contains no such limitations. It is a proclamation of national emergency without any limitations whatever. Under it the President can exercise all the powers of a national emergency which he can exercise without specific authority of Congress. The only limitation is the limitation voluntarily placed by the President upon himself in his discussion with newspapermen, when he stated that he only intended to use a portion of those powers at this time.

The exercise of some of those powers under Executive order has not been precisely reassuring. One of the first was an order nullifying the civil-service laws and regulations of the United States with regard to all matters connected with "preparedness or neutrality," terms so broad that they might be construed to cover almost any governmental activity.

Far more important and far more disquieting is the Executive order transferring control of the Panama Canal Zone from the Governor of the Canal Zone to the Army. The Executive order recites that it is done pursuant to authority vested in the President by section 8 of the Canal Zone Code. But an examination of that section of the statute shows that it vests authority in the President only when there is a state of war in which the United States is engaged or when war is imminent.

The Executive order, therefore, amounts to a certificate by the President either that a state of war exists in which we are engaged or that war is imminent. It may be, Mr. President, that it is desirable or necessary to transfer control of the zone from the Governor, who is a brigadier general in the Regular Army, to the Army commander in the zone who is a major general. If so, I dare assert that a resolution giving such authority to the President could have been passed by unanimous consent through both Houses in a single day. I merely point out that to accomplish that purpose by Executive order, with the necessity of finding that war is imminent, cannot be reassuring to our people.

Far more dangerous because far more calculated to alarm and inflame our people—and perhaps deliberately intended for that purpose—are the irresponsible statements and actions of certain officials who only by reason of their position carry a certain weight of authority. An example was the speech on yesterday by Assistant Secretary of War Louis Johnson in which he sought to inflame the people as to the safety of our own shores by comparing our situation to that of Poland. In my judgment, no more idiotic, moronic, unpatriotic remark has ever been made by a man in a high public position. To compare the situation of the United States, located between Canada and Mexico, with 3,000 miles of ocean between us and any possible adversary on one side and 7,000 miles of sea between us and any possible adversary on the other, and with a superb Navy and a magnificent air force, with the situation of Poland, caught in a nutcracker, surrounded on three sides by Germany and the other side by Russia, is an attempt to alarm and excite our people which, to my mind, is beneath contempt.

This is the same Louis Johnson, who has been flying around the country in an Army plane for the past several years preaching the inevitability of war and the certainty of our being drawn in, and drawing horrific pictures with grisly prophecies of our own shores being invaded and our own land being laid waste.

This is the same Louis Johnson who recently, without any apparent authority of law, set up a War Resources Board, stacked its personnel with Morgan-Du Pont-controlled members, and publicly announced that as soon as we entered into war, under authority of an act which has never been passed by the Congress, the War Resources Board would become the War Resources Administration, and its chairman, the head of the Steel Trust, would become the virtual economic and industrial dictator—except for price fixing, which was to be handled by another similar committee. To be sure, after the affiliations of the personnel of the War Industries Board were exposed, the President announced that they would soon conclude their labors and be disbanded, but Louis Johnson is still in office and the Board has not been disbanded.

This is the same Louis Johnson who furnished an office in the War Department to Leo M. Cherne to write a book called *Adjusting Your Business to War*, and then wrote a foreword in terms of fulsome adulation to that work.

I was able to obtain the loan of a copy of this book, although it was not written for the perusal of such as I. This book describes in detail the Fascist plans contemplated by the War Department in the event of war, including drafting of manpower, regimentation of industry, restriction of the rights of labor, relaxation of the laws with regard to women and child labor, censorship, and many other subjects. To be sure, the President stated that the book had no administration approval, but Louis Johnson is still in office and the authenticity of the book as to the provisions of the Army mobilization plan has not been questioned.

No less reprehensible, in my opinion, is the effort of the War Department to make the Nation war-minded by preparations for the draft. Already—when we have no quarrel with any nation in the world—with no authority of law whatever, officials are going about the country training draft boards for the purpose of conscripting the youth of our land for military service.

Mr. President, I say it is a shameful thing when, without the authority of Congress, plans are already far under way for drafting boys 18 years old who have not even had the poor privilege of voting for those who pass the laws and determine the policies which would send them to the shambles.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator made a statement with reference to draft boards. What is the Senator's authority for that statement?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The matter appeared in all the public press. One meeting is to be held this week, I believe, in Chicago. Another is to be held in New Orleans. According to the War Department release, meetings are to be held all over the country, in which draft boards are to be directed and trained, and local boards are to be appointed and are to proceed as soon as the necessary legislation can be passed to put them into effect. Mr. President, I say it is a shameful thing, because it can have no other purpose than inflaming the people and making them war-minded.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. BURKE. I am very much interested in the statement just made by the Senator that plans are completed for the formation of draft boards and all the machinery necessary to put a draft law into effect. I read the newspapers with extreme care and I have seen nothing of that kind. Will the Senator be a little more explicit?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I saw the statement in a War Department release. I do not happen to have it with me, but I shall be glad to supply it to the Senator. It is a War Department release, as I recall, on Monday of this week. I cut it out of the Washington Post. It contained a full account of the proceedings of these draft boards.

Mr. BURKE. I shall be very glad to see any release of that kind. Meanwhile, pending that, I shall retain in my own mind very great and open doubt as to whether any such plans have been made.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is usually the condition of the Senator from Nebraska, I have observed. [Laughter.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri subsequently said: Mr. President, in view of the question raised during my remarks by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BURKE] as to the War Department's plan for training and drilling draft boards, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks an article appearing in the Washington Post of Thursday, October 5, headed:

Draft Boards To Lay Plans for M. Day. Army-Navy Selective Service Committee Sets Four Conferences.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BURKE. I shall be very glad to read the article.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I commend it to the Senator's open mind.

Mr. BURKE. Is it just a newspaper story? I thought it was an official release.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I understand the Post vouches for it as being based on official information.

Mr. BURKE. I will examine it.

(See exhibit C.)

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I have said from beginning to end of this debate, and I repeat, that my interest in this whole subject is the interest of the people of the United States. Whatever may be my sympathies with regard to this

war, my sympathies are far more with the people of the United States, who would have to pay the price if we should get into the war. While my sympathies and my interests are, first and last, those of the people of the United States, I am persuaded that a selfish interest in the people of the United States is by no means incompatible or inconsistent with the best interests of the people of the world. I say that, so far as the belligerents and the combatants themselves are concerned, the greatest aid we can render to them is by staying out of the war ourselves, preserving our resources, preserving our man power, and preserving our own institutions. I say that when the present war ends—and it will almost inevitably be a war of exhaustion—we can do a great deal more for the rehabilitation of the world with our resources and our free institutions if we are able to go to the belligerent nations and help them to rehabilitate themselves than if, in the meantime, we have been dragged into the war, our own manpower has been exhausted, our own wealth has been dissipated, and we come out of it, like the other belligerents, exhausted from the struggle. I believe the interests of the countries which are now belligerent nations, as well as the interests of the United States, require us to attend to our own business and stay out of the war.

Mr. President, in conclusion let me say that in certain quarters there has been for some time an effort to use the term "isolationist" as a term of opprobrium applied to those of us who oppose the emasculating of the Neutrality Act, and are determined to exhaust every possible effort to keep this Nation out of war. So far as I am concerned, I use that term—which is intended as a term of opprobrium—as a badge of honor. If the attitude of the United States staying at home and attending to its own business is isolationism, then George Washington was an isolationist; Thomas Jefferson was an isolationist; the Adamases, Madison, Monroe, Andrew Jackson, the men who made this country great, were isolationists. If that means isolationism, President Roosevelt was an isolationist in his great speech at Chautauqua, N. Y., in 1936, although he specifically denied it when he said, "We are not isolationists except in the sense that we want to isolate this country completely from war." As a matter of fact, Mr. President, the term "insulation" would be a much apter description of our position. We want to insulate this country from being set afire by the conflagration abroad. But, no matter what the motive of the application of that term, I am certain that those of us who adhere to that position accept it and wear it as a badge of honor.

For myself, Mr. President, in the past few years, on hundreds of stumps in Missouri and outside Missouri, I have pledged myself that I would never vote to send American boys abroad to die in foreign quarrels that did not concern us. Today, with world catastrophe once more upon us, I renew that pledge. So far as I am concerned, I will never, never, never vote to send American boys abroad to die in other peoples' quarrels, or take any step or cast any vote which in my judgment contributes to that end.

Mr. President, if that be isolationism, anybody—anybody, high or low—is welcome to make the most of it.

EXHIBIT A

[Corwin's letter to New York Times]

OCTOBER 2, 1939.

In going before Congress to urge repeal of the arms embargo the President undertook an unaccustomed role for him—that of opponent of legal change, of champion of ancient wont and use. The novelty of the part perhaps accounts for his rather unsatisfying performance of it. Mr. Roosevelt asserts in his opening sentence that the embargo "impairs the peaceful relations of the United States with foreign nations"; and he later adds his "deep and unalterable conviction . . . that by the repeal of the embargo the United States will more probably remain at peace than if the law remains as it stands today."

In support of neither assertion nor conviction, however, does he adduce any proof of either factual or logical nature except a reference to "years of experience as a worker in international peace" most of which must have antedated his original approval of the embargo.

He finds to be sure the distinction which the embargo provision sets up between completed implements of war and the materials out of which they are made an "artificial" one and he challenges "those who seek to retain the present embargo position" to "be

wholly consistent and seek legislation to cut off cloth and copper and meat and wheat and a thousand other articles from all of the nations at war."

CONSISTENCY QUESTIONED

But obviously the fact that this distinction is "artificial" would not necessarily make it a source of danger to our relations with other countries, while the appeal to consistency is an argument which can be worked both ways. Mr. Roosevelt himself would have to admit that it is "artificial" to distinguish between one who makes a gun and puts it into the hands of another in the certain knowledge that it will be used by that other against a third person, and on the other hand one who fires a gun himself at said third person. Yet this is precisely the distinction on which neutral status pivots. Would Mr. Roosevelt abandon this "artificial" distinction in the present instance?

The fact is, of course, that most legal distinctions are artificial, otherwise the law would not have had to intervene to set them up. And the distinction which the President attacks is derived from the very international law which he so much praises, and to which he is so anxious to return. What is more, he himself adopts it at the end, when he urges the retention of the present "license system covering import and export of arms, ammunition, and implements of war," and the present ban on the shipment of these to belligerent countries on American vessels. Of the latter he says, "This provision should not be disturbed."

THE JEFFERSON PARALLEL

Mr. Roosevelt also endeavors to bolster his case by an appeal to history. He seeks to affix to the present embargo the odium which Jefferson's embargo incurred some 130 years ago. Referring to our struggle to keep out of the Napoleonic wars, he says:

"We acted for some years under the so-called Embargo and Non-intercourse Acts. That policy turned out to be a disastrous failure—first, because it brought our own Nation close to ruin, and second, because it was the major cause of bringing us into active participation in European wars in our own War of 1812. It is merely reciting history to recall to you that one of the results of the policy of embargo and nonintercourse was the burning in 1814 of part of this Capitol in which we are assembled."

Coming from the present leader of the Democratic Party, this attack on the principal and most obstinately persisted-in policy of the party's founder seems an argument of desperation. At least, it will come as news to most students of American history that Jefferson's embargo brought on the War of 1812.

Another argument the President phrased thus: "From a purely material point of view, what is the advantage to us in sending all manner of articles across the ocean for final processing there, when we could give employment to thousands by doing it here? Incidentally, and again from the material point of view, by such employment we automatically aid our own national defense."

ARGUMENT IS CRITICIZED

The argument is both irrelevant to the main issue and unconvincing in itself. The Congress has recently appropriated some billions of dollars toward this country's rearmament. Is their expenditure to be postponed in order that we may supply the warring European countries with arms, or are the two things to proceed concomitantly? If the latter, we shall have on our hands at the end of hostilities a vastly overdeveloped munitions industry, just as we did at the end of the World War, and a second economic collapse of more or less serious character. It is true that this danger would be somewhat mitigated by adoption of the cash-and-carry plan, although that is entirely without sanction from international law.

Finally, the President advances the following argument: "Repeal of the embargo and a return to international law are the crux of this issue. The enactment of the embargo provisions did more than merely reverse our traditional policy. It had the effect of putting land powers on the same footing as naval powers, so far as sea-borne commerce was concerned. A land power which threatened war could thus feel assured in advance that any prospective sea-power antagonist would be weakened through denial of its ancient right to buy anything anywhere."

"This, 4 years ago, gave a definite advantage to one belligerent as against another, not through his own strength or geographic position, but through an affirmative act of ours. Removal of the embargo is merely reverting to the sounder international practice, and pursuing in time of war as in the time of peace our ordinary trade policies. This will be liked by some and disliked by others, depending on the view they take on the present war, but that is not the issue. The step I recommend is to put this country on the solid footing of real and traditional neutrality."

There is some confusion of statements, possibly of thought, here. "Four years ago," when the embargo was enacted, there were no belligerents; it was a period of peace, at any rate as respects the land and naval powers to whom the President refers. Can it be conceded, then, that the United States is not free to revise its trade policies in time of peace, whatever the repercussions may be upon the opposed interest of future belligerents? Certainly no such concession can be made unless international law requires it.

The fact is that the foregoing argument rests on a mistaken assumption, namely, that neutrals are under a positive obligation to trade with belligerents. The international law to which the President constantly appeals knows no such rule. That law merely permits neutrals to trade with belligerents, subject to the hazards to which the rules concerning contraband and blockade give rise; it no more requires neutrals to sell to belligerents than it requires

them to produce for belligerents. The President's argument subjects neutral interests to an utterly unheard-of servitude in favor of belligerents, and at the same time quite gratuitously presents the naval powers with a grievance made up out of whole cloth.

There may be plenty of sound arguments for the repeal of the arms embargo. If so, the President has been singularly unsuccessful in discovering them. The address to Congress does not make out a case for its main proposal, and shows a disturbing lack of clarity on the part of the administration as to its own guiding intention.

EDWARD S. CORWIN.

PRINCETON, N. J., September 29, 1939.

EXHIBIT B

In a clear and concise letter of September 20, 1939, to the New York Times, written jointly by Professor Jessup and by Prof. Charles Cheney Hyde, also of Columbia University, these eminent international lawyers write:

"The Congress about to convene will be called upon to make a momentous decision—whether it shall remove the existing embargo on munitions of war to belligerent countries. The issue is not merely one of policy, it is rather one of law. To put it differently, the Congress must first consider and decide whether any legal duty rests upon the United States as a neutral not to remove the embargo. The decision on this point needs to be taken before any other can be intelligently or wisely reached.

"The situation confronting the United States today is sharply different from that of a month ago, before the war broke out. While peace reigned no international obstacle hindered Congress from legislating as it might see fit. With the outbreak of war, however, the situation changed overnight. The United States found itself, and still finds itself, as a neutral burdened with a number of well-recognized duties toward all of the warring states. These duties it is not free to alter according to its convenience or preference. The fact that these duties are owed to a belligerent with whose policies it has no sympathy does not change the duties; it merely makes it extremely hard for the Nation to keep its balance and to be guided by its head rather than its heart."

Professors Jessup and Hyde go on to indicate what the neutral duties of the United States are in this situation:

"What are the outstanding duties which the United States as a neutral must respect? Here are a few. Its Government must remain strictly impartial, whatever be the feelings of the people; it must not itself furnish aid to any belligerent; it must not take sides in the war; it must not directly or indirectly assist a favored belligerent at the expense of its foe.

"It is true that international law does not normally oblige a neutral state to prevent its citizens from exporting munitions of war from its territory. Yet the freedom from such an obligation vanishes when once the government of the neutral has itself undertaken, as by its statutory law enacted in time of peace, to forbid exportations to belligerents and has made the matter of exportation one of government control. Thereafter, when war ensues, it requires affirmative governmental action to permit exportations of previously forbidden articles from neutral territory.

"Hence, relaxation of embargoes after the outbreak of war may in fact and in law amount to governmental participation in the conflict. This is obvious if or when the reason for removing a particular embargo is to aid the cause of one or more of the fighting states which will vastly profit from such action because of their command of the seas. In such a situation the neutral purveyor becomes the special support or prop of the favored belligerent, and the government as well as the people of the neutral becomes in reality a participant in the conflict. Such conduct is, under such circumstances, unneutral and is contemptuous of the legal duty which the law of nations imposes upon every neutral sovereign."

They point out that repeal of the arms embargo at this time gives England and France a distinct advantage over their enemy and, in fact, makes the United States the ally of England and France. Their letter states:

"To be more precise, if the Congress, in order to strengthen the sinews of France and England, removes the present embargo so as to enable those powers to gain a distinct advantage over their enemy, the United States makes itself in fact the ally of those who secure its sustenance. But, more than that, such conduct is illegal as well as unneutral, and may, if resorted to, place the Nation in a most embarrassing and even hypocritical position when it undertakes to assert its neutral rights which Secretary Hull recently announced we had not abandoned.

"The precise ground of objection would be that our Government, having in time of peace asserted control over and forbidden the exportations of munitions in wars which might ensue, cannot relax its grip without affirmative congressional action, and that such relaxation being the direct expression of a notorious desire to help a particular cause constitutes a governmental taking of sides which is unneutral and illegal.

"Thus these two factors—the governmental control already achieved by an act of Congress and a governmental desire to relax that control so as to help France and England—would combine to produce a result that the opposing belligerent, Germany, would pounce upon to establish the unneutral aspect of embargo-removing legislation. These factors would render inept and unconvincing the contention that when or if Congress removed an embargo which the United States was not obliged to impose, no legal duty to any belligerent is involved, provided every state engaged in war enjoys equal freedom to help itself to American resources."

Taking up the argument that the United States is free to lift the embargo now while war is in progress, provided that it allows every belligerent to buy munitions here, these well-known scholars point out:

"The answer is that the manipulation of American governmental control already established through a statutory embargo, with the deliberate design of aiding a particular group of warring powers by an effort that takes cognizance of their relative supremacy at sea, is a deliberate taking of sides which marks intervention in the conflict. Such intervention is not impartial in spirit, and it is not abstention from participation in the war. It is, on the contrary, a specious form of interposition sought to be disguised under a cloak of professed equality of treatment of the opposing contenders. Yet the real character of such conduct shines out like a lighthouse in the fog.

"It is not here sought or necessary to press the contention that neutral contributions of munitions of war to belligerent states tend to bring the contributor into the conflict and to make it the enemy of that belligerent which suffers a distinct detriment from its conduct. At the moment that is a matter of secondary importance. The question of the hour is whether the United States is today, with its present neutrality law on the books, free under the law of nations to remove embargoes in order to help the enemies of Germany. It is believed that the United States has not been free since September 3.

"If this conclusion is correct, what would be the consequences of American unneutral participation in the war as against Germany? It is perhaps unnecessary to consider how Germany as an offended belligerent would seek to vindicate its rights. It may merely be recalled that as a result of Washington's and Jefferson's frank recognition of neutral duties we paid England about \$143,000 for our breaches of neutral duty in the 1790's, and that in 1873 England paid the United States \$15,500,000 for English breaches of neutral duty during the American Civil War.

"It is not suggested, however, that our national action should be determined on the basis of fear that we should be liable to pay a bill for damages, no matter how large. It is rather suggested that the United States today, as in the time of President Washington, should be guided by a decent respect for its obligations under international law.

"Within the past 2 years American governmental utterances, embracing those of our faithful and high-minded Secretary of State, have deplored the lawlessness of some other countries and their contempt for the precepts of international law. Such denunciations lose their influence and confidence if the integrity of the Nation is impaired."

Professors Jessup and Hyde appeal in the final paragraph of their letter for an honest consideration of the issue at stake:

"A country such as our own needs today, when its Congress is summoned for a particular purpose, to consider honestly, resolutely, and fearlessly the question whether it can modify its law in order to assist one set of belligerents whose cause it favors without becoming a deliberate violator of the law of nations. Unless it can answer that question affirmatively in the best of faith and in the light of law and practice it cannot at this time relax its embargoes without besmirching its character as an advocate of international justice.

"The United States is free to enter the war as a belligerent if it decides so to do. We express no opinion on the wisdom of such a choice, but if the sympathies and conviction of all its people demand that course of action, it will be taken; let it then be taken boldly and frankly. But if the sober judgment of the American people is that our duty and our interest require that we be neutral, let us follow that course with equal honesty and with respect for that international law of which we pride ourselves on being the champion." (New York Times, September 21, 1939.)

EXHIBIT C

DRAFT BOARDS TO LAY PLANS FOR M DAY—ARMY-NAVY SELECTIVE SERVICE COMMITTEE SETS FOUR CONFERENCES

Members of the Army-Navy selective-service committee will meet in Chicago Monday for a 2-week conference with State draft committees on plans for the mobilization of manpower in the event of war.

Officials said the meeting was the first of four to be held in the next 6 months to perfect draft plans and train committees of Army and Navy Reservists in the establishment of local draft boards in an emergency. A similar conference will be held in New Orleans in February, another here in April, and the last in May.

The latest selective-service plan, officials said, follows rather closely the system in effect during the World War. Principal differences lie in the administration of the draft and the ages to be called. National and local civilian boards will handle the job, instead of the Army.

While the first draft will call all men between 21 and 30, as in 1917, the second will include those 18 to 21, younger men than those ordered up 22 years ago. The third draft, as in the World War, calls all men 18 to 45 years of age. Exemptions for physical disability and dependency will follow the 1917 practice, while in any future war, many more waivers will be granted to skilled workers and executives in key industries.

These provisions are not now law, but in case of an emergency, it is expected that legislation setting up such a draft would be rushed through Congress.

Mr. BURKE obtained the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Danaher	Johnson, Colo.	Reed
Andrews	Davis	King	Reynolds
Austin	Donahey	La Follette	Russell
Bailey	Downey	Lee	Schwartz
Bankhead	Ellender	Lodge	Schwellenbach
Barbour	Frazier	Lucas	Sheppard
Barkley	George	Lundeen	Shipstead
Bilbo	Gerry	McCarran	Slattery
Borah	Gibson	McKellar	Smathers
Bridges	Gillette	McNary	Stewart
Brown	Green	Maloney	Taft
Bulow	Guffey	Mead	Thomas, Okla.
Burke	Gurney	Minton	Thomas, Utah
Byrd	Hale	Murray	Townsend
Byrnes	Harrison	Neely	Truman
Capper	Hatch	Norris	Tydings
Caraway	Herring	Nye	Vandenberg
Chandler	Hill	O'Mahoney	Van Nuys
Chavez	Holman	Overton	Wagner
Clark, Idaho	Holt	Pepper	Wheeler
Clark, Mo.	Hughes	Pittman	White
Connally	Johnson, Calif.	Radcliffe	Wiley

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. President, in what I have to say today on the extremely important question now under discussion I wish to make it clear at the very outset that I am expressing only my personal views. No other person in or out of Congress can properly be charged with the slightest responsibility for any statements that I shall make. If there be those who disapprove of what I have to say, or, approving, question the wisdom of saying it in this place and at this time, I offer in justification only the obligation that all men owe to speak the truth as God gives them to see the truth. That which I am about to say is born of a sincere conviction that it is the truth and that no good end will be served by closing our eyes to the realities of the situation which confronts us.

To me it seems that the proper definition of a neutral is that he is one who stands apart and permits no act of his to give material aid, support, or favor of any kind to either party to a controversy. Apply that test and it becomes clear at once that the law which we seek to amend does not place us in the position of a neutral. As long as it remains on the statute books we cannot properly be called neutral, for admittedly the present law does greatly favor one belligerent. By the same token, the pending proposal in the nature of a substitute, considering all of the circumstances under which it must operate when enacted, is in no real sense a neutrality measure. I do not say this in criticism of the Pittman joint resolution. I approve it, but not in the belief that it is a move toward scrupulous neutrality. May I say at once that the time has come when it is imperative that we in this country apply ourselves to a task of far greater importance than the impossible effort to maintain a strictly neutral position. The clear duty of this Congress is to legislate for the safety and the security of America. Neutrality has its importance, but only as it affects the larger problem—the welfare of our common country. To be faithful to the trust imposed in us we must disregard the sentimental pleas of well-meaning people who have not had the opportunity to consider the subject in all of its aspects; we must reject organized clamor, lay aside preconceived notions, and, with firm hearts, steel ourselves to whatever action and sacrifices may be necessary to protect the fundamental rights of America.

There is a time for compromise, for yielding, for appeasement, if you will. That hour is past. We need a rebaptism in the faith and the courage of our fathers. It is all very well to say that we love peace and hate war. We can all subscribe to that without any reservation whatever. I will go as far as anyone to promote the former and prevent the latter. But we may as well recognize that we live in a world wherein, unfortunately, force is still the only language that many understand. Until that condition can be corrected, it will be best for us to master that language. Only harm can result if

the erroneous impression is permitted to be spread abroad and at home that America has no rights which it cherishes so deeply that it will fight to the last drop rather than surrender them.

For example—and for example only—it must have shocked many, as it has shocked me, to have it argued from the public rostrum, and even here on the floor of the Senate, as one reason why we should not take a certain course of action that it might offend a particular foreign nation whose spies and saboteurs within our borders would then be instructed to dynamite our mills and factories.

There is only one proper answer to that kind of a suggestion. It is the answer given by Ambassador Gerard to the warning of a high official of a foreign power then, as now, engaged in war. The warning was: Two million men in the United States owe such allegiance to the land of their birth that unless our country pursued a certain course of action these men would not respect the property or the lives of our citizens. The answer: We have 2,000,000 lampposts to take care of just such false Americans.

Mr. President, I propose to lay down three propositions which seem to me to be incontrovertible. I have indicated what they are. First, the present act does not operate in a neutral manner. To replace it with the pending substitute would not be in accord with strict neutrality. Since we cannot, then, be scrupulously neutral in either event, and even if that were possible, it should be our single purpose to follow that course of action, regardless of anyone's conception of strict neutrality, which appears most beneficial to the United States—most likely to keep us out of war, as the Senator from Missouri so urgently pleaded a few moments ago; most conducive to an early and lasting peace among the warring nations; most certain to preserve this country as one place where there may be the fullest development of democratic processes. We proceed, then, to enlarge upon these three propositions:

First. The arms-embargo provision of our so-called Neutrality Act clearly favors one of the belligerents in the war that is now raging in Europe. By hampering the Allies in their prosecution of that war the arms embargo favors Germany to the certain extent of prolonging the war for many months, if not years. It favors Germany to what seems to many the probable extent of enabling Germany to bring about a stalemate, with most of the objectives won for which Hitler began the war. It favors Germany to the possible extent, some feel, of enabling it to emerge victorious from that war.

If these premises are well taken—and I am very sure that they cannot be successfully disputed—how can anyone read neutrality into the present law? Of course, it may be said that, admitting all that is claimed as to the operation of our law, what business is it of ours how our law affects other countries or who wins the European war? My views on that question will be unfolded as I proceed. The point I make now is that every day of inaction means that we are permitting an unneutral act to remain in force. What a hoax has been perpetrated upon so many thousands of well-meaning citizens all over this land who have been induced by demagogues to wire or write their representatives in Washington to "Save our Neutrality Act"; "Make no change in our neutrality law"; "Oppose repeal of the arms embargo and keep neutral"! All this in face of the fact that the Neutrality Act is anything but neutral. Whatever else may be said in favor of those who thus present their demands, the action they urge is not that of a neutral.

Mr. President, I would respect the sincerity, however much I would have to question the good sense, of the individual who would implore me to keep this law intact because he hates England, because he mistrusts France, because he wants to hamper them both in every way possible, or because he approves of Hitlerism and wishes it given a free hand in all of Europe. The point I make is that a law which in operation is prejudicial to Britain and France and favorable to the spread of Hitlerism ought not to be defended in the name of neutrality.

For myself, I see no justification on any ground for permitting a law to stand that favors Hitlerism.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURKE. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to ask a question purely for information. Has any other nation in the world at this time an embargo law?

Mr. BURKE. I have been advised that certain of the Scandinavian countries either have or are considering the imposition of an embargo on arms, and that during the World War some of those nations did have such an embargo. They were caught right in the midst of the war, and for their own protection and because they were weak and helpless, they thought their interests would be served by an embargo. I think if such an embargo on arms from Denmark and some other countries is not now in force that in all likelihood it will be if the war continues. The manufacture of arms and munitions and implements of war in those countries is comparatively minor, but they do supply other essentials of war, such as coal and minerals of various kinds, and so far as I know no embargo has been placed on any of those other essentials of war.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the reason I asked the question is that I read somewhere—I do not now recall where—the broad statement made that no other nation except the United States at this time had an effective embargo.

Mr. BURKE. I doubt whether that is correct. But the instances on the other side are minor, and I could not be certain that any of them have as yet actually been put into effect.

Mr. President, I have been saying with respect to the law which we have on the statute books, this embargo on the sale to belligerents of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, that whatever else may be said in favor of the way it is operating, it should not be defended on the ground of neutrality, because it is indisputably of immense and immeasurable value to one of the belligerents in this war, and I was proceeding to say that, altogether aside from the question of the measure being vulnerable on the ground of its lack of carrying out the true principles of neutrality, I can see no reason whatever, on any ground, why this country should want to favor the things that we know as Hitlerism.

Mr. President, must we close our ears to his broken promises? Must we shut our eyes to the fate of one after another of the independent nations of Europe that stood in his path to power and chanced to be not strong enough to resist his advances? Must we blot from our memory his record of religious persecutions? Of racial atrocities? Of the suppression of individual freedom?

Is there in America anyone who doubts that Hitlerism, which is now spreading over Europe, means just what I have described? On the point of religious persecution let me quote from the reliable London Catholic Herald of December 31, 1937:

His Holiness has referred in very serious terms to Germany, stating that things must be called by their real names. "We wish to speak," said the pope, "of the very sad fact of persecution in Germany, because we want to give things their proper name. In Germany there is a religious persecution. It is being said, and has been said for a long time, that that is not true. We know, however, that it is a persecution, and a grave one. Seldom there has been a persecution which was so serious, so terrible, so painful, and so sad in its deepest consequences. It is a persecution where neither the use of violence nor the pressure of menaces nor the deceptions of cunning and lie are missing."

In determining whether we want to continue a law which favors Hitlerism, we can properly consider the attitude and conduct of those who direct that movement toward minority groups, particularly the Jews. The story of recent and repeated atrocities is so fresh in our minds that further proof is unnecessary. I give only this brief statement from an outstanding American citizen whose sources of information are complete and whose veracity is above question. He said:

The sufferings of the Jews in Germany have been so horrible, so terrifying, so diabolical that no man of sensibility would even dare make a public recital of them.

It will be said that, greatly as we deplore the intolerable organized and government-sponsored persecution of racial

and religious minorities, much as we regret the suppression of individual freedom and the overrunning of independent small nations, nevertheless we ought not to indulge in re-creation over internal policies of other nations regarding which we have no rightful concern. Even if it were true—which I deny, and the falsity whereof I will demonstrate—that the question of the rights of minorities in other lands to life, liberty, and property is so much a matter of internal policy that we ought to refrain from expression of our moral indignation when those rights are persistently flouted, it would still be proper for each of us to weigh those facts in determining whether we want to continue in force a law of our own which is of tremendous aid to the very governing authorities clearly guilty of such atrocious conduct.

Moreover, it is my contention that traditional American policy does not require us to pursue a course of silence in the face of barbaric outrages systematically perpetrated upon helpless minorities anywhere on earth. Never in the history of this country has there been any hesitation to denounce such persecutions and atrocities. A deaf ear has always been turned in this country to the plea that to speak out under such circumstances, to give voice to our moral indignation, might involve us in the domestic policy of some other nation.

I give the Senate these words of John Quincy Adams in the early days of this Republic. Said he:

This principle that a whole nation has a right to do whatever it pleases cannot in any sense be admitted as true. The eternal and immutable laws of justice and of morality are paramount to all human legislation. If, therefore, a majority thus constituted are bound by no law, human or divine, and have no other rule but their sovereign will and pleasure to direct them, what possible security can any citizen of the nation have for the protection of his inalienable rights?

A compatriot of Adams, in answering that question, referred to the spiritual ties which bind all men together—ties not woven by human policy nor subject to being cut asunder by statesmen. He declared that those are mistaken who take the position that "a nation has no right to interfere morally with other nations." Every community, he said, is responsible to other communities for its laws and conduct; "not responsible in the sense of being liable to physical punishment and force, but in the sense of just exposure and reprobation and scorn." That is a moral control which nations have the right, nay, are bound to exercise over others, for "the chief wall of defense round property and life" is not the judgment of courts but the moral judgment of individuals and of states.

Nearly 60 years ago the world was shocked by the terrible persecutions of Jews in Russia. Mass meetings of protest were held throughout this country. The call for such a gathering in New York was issued by a group of distinguished citizens, including ex-President Grant. The meeting was called to order by the mayor of New York City, who said:

In the name of freedom of thought, of religious liberty, I feel that we are called upon to protest against the tyrannical illiberality of a government which permits the persecution of an entire people for the simple reason that they are of a peculiar race and peculiar faith.

On that occasion an address was delivered by former Secretary of State William M. Evarts, in the course of which he declared:

But it is said, "Do not nations correspond only through governments, and are not governments clothed with complete authority within the territories over which they rule, and are they not jealous of any intimations or suggestions made by friendly governments, however close their amity may be?" Well, gentlemen, the time has gone when kings, couriers, and ships of war were the only messengers between nations, and when state proclamations and announcements of ambassadors were the only messages that passed between nation and nation. * * * Nations now speak directly to nations, under no constraint or formality, and under no difficulty of making themselves understood.

In the early days of the present century this country was similarly aroused. A true expression of the traditional American policy was eloquently set forth by a great American statesman, former President Grover Cleveland. I quote this brief excerpt:

This demonstration—

Speaking of a great mass meeting in New York City—

furnishes cheering and reassuring evidence that our American sympathy for the oppressed and abused, wherever they may be, our American love of humanity, and our attachment to justice and right, are still active and unimpaired. * * * Our people, when their sympathies are touched, when their humane instincts are challenged, and when their hatred of oppression is aroused, are not afraid to speak; and in such circumstances it is not their habit to smother or cautiously soften their words. * * * Let the people of the United States, gathered together in such assemblages as this in every part of the land, fearlessly speak to the civilized world, protesting against every pretense of civilization that permits medieval persecution, against every bigoted creed that forbids religious toleration and freedom of conscience, against all false enlightenment that excuses hatred and cruelty toward any race of men, and against all spurious forms of government protection that withhold from any human being the right to live in safety and toil in peace.

On all these occasions it was recognized that we were powerless to prevent by force a continuation of the persecutions. The American policy has been that it is our right and our solemn duty vigorously to protest such outrages, and that in so doing we will aid in developing a moral sense of indignation that the guilty nations dare not long ignore. It has always been urged by the offending country that no outsiders have any right to interfere with its internal affairs. The world has been asked to believe that when any country undertakes a program of persecution and the infliction of atrocities as the outgrowth of prejudice against race or religion, the inhabitants of other lands should do nothing, say nothing, but recognize and treat the situation as purely domestic. It has been said that protests, if made, might be considered unfriendly acts, and might lead to serious consequences. Americans have ever been ready to run that risk. The American policy was never better stated than by a great American patriot of the State of Massachusetts, who used these words:

I claim the right of pleading the cause of the oppressed, whether he suffers in this country or another. I utterly deny that people can screen themselves behind their nationality from the moral judgment of the world. Because they form themselves into a state, and forbid within bounds a single voice to rise in behalf of the injured, because they crush the weak under the forms of law, do they thereby put a seal on the lips of foreigners? Do they disarm the moral sentiment of other nations? Is this among the rights of sovereignty, that a people, however criminal, shall stand unproved? * * * If, in the opinion of the civilized world, or of any portion of it, we of this Commonwealth are robbing men of their dearest rights and treading them in the dust, let the wrong be proclaimed far and wide. * * * If the oppressed are muzzled here, let the lips of the free elsewhere give voice to their wrongs.

After one more example to show the true American policy, I must proceed with the matters more or less directly concerned. When Daniel Webster was a Member of this body he declared, in a speech at Boston:

We have all had our sympathies enlisted in the Hungarian effort for liberty. We have all wept at its failure. Despotism power from abroad intervened to suppress the hope of free government in Hungary. * * * Gentlemen, there is something on earth greater than arbitrary or despotic power, and that is the aroused indignation of the civilized world. If the Emperor of Russia shall so violate international law as to seize these Hungarians—

Referring, of course, to Kossuth and his colleagues—

and execute them, he will stand as a criminal factor in the view of the public law of the world. The whole world will be the tribunal to try him and he must abide its judgment.

Webster later, officially, set forth the views of this Government on the same matter, he having in the meantime become Secretary of State. He said:

While performing with strict and exact fidelity all their neutral duties, nothing will deter either the Government or the people of the United States from exercising at their own discretion the rights belonging to them as an independent nation, and of forming and expressing their own opinions, freely and at all times, upon the great political events which may transpire among the civilized nations of the earth.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUSSELL in the chair). Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. BURKE. I very gladly yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GILLETTE. The Senator has just very cogently given expression to sentiments which I believe are shared with him by most Americans, and has bolstered his arguments, which

needed no bolstering, with quotations. I am wondering if the Senator shares with the rest of the American people the same type of abhorrence with reference to the treatment of the Chinese people by the Japanese.

Mr. BURKE. I do, fully and completely; and I am now and have been and will continue to be ready to join in any movement participated in by the Senator from Iowa that may express our abhorrence of the treatment of the Chinese, and our determination to remedy it so far as it lies within our power.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BURKE. I yield.

Mr. GILLETTE. I was sure, Mr. President, that the Senator would express exactly that sentiment, which does him credit. He has just given expression to the thought that our present neutrality law has become particularly unneutral in its effect, favoring the German nation as against France and England. I am wondering whether he has in mind the fact that the enactment of the present proposal, if it is given effect by proclamation, will operate to the strangulation of China and any possibility of success she may have in the present war over there.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. President, I have not given attention to that question; and I should be very greatly distressed if that should prove to be so. Without varying in any way my statement in reference to my regard for the Chinese, and my hope that they may be able to retain their integrity as a nation, I still say that the main danger to the world at present lies in another sector, in the spread of nazism and communism; and I am not going to be diverted from my attention to that problem by the troubles of other peoples anywhere else in the world, however much I may sympathize with them.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURKE. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. Of course, the Senator realizes what the Nazis have done to the Jews in Germany; and we all share his horror at such treatment.

Mr. BURKE. Also the Catholics.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes; but the Nazi treatment of Catholics is nothing compared with what they have done to the Jews.

Mr. BURKE. That is correct.

Mr. WHEELER. Let me call the Senator's attention to the fact that over the years the Jews have been persecuted more in Poland than in any other country in the world.

Mr. BURKE. Does the Senator from Montana offer that as a justification for wiping Poland off the map?

Mr. WHEELER. No; I do not offer it as a justification for wiping Poland off the map; but when we are talking about persecution and about grabbing land, Poland has done her share, and Poland has persecuted the Jews as much as, if not more than has any other nation in the world.

I am not justifying anything Mr. Hitler has done. I despise Mr. Hitler and Hitlerism as much as does the Senator from Nebraska. However, I am not a German; I am not a Frenchman; I am not an Irishman. First of all, I am an American citizen; and I want to do everything I can to keep this country out of war and to keep democracy safe in the United States of America.

Mr. BURKE. I thank the Senator very much for that contribution. I hope before I shall have concluded he will see that at least I am striving for exactly the same end, and that, although we may differ as to the best way of accomplishment, we are working toward exactly the same goal.

Mr. WHEELER. So far as I have heard Senators express their opinions, I think we are all trying to work to the same end. I must say I was shocked when the Senator from Missouri called my attention to a statement supposedly made by a Senator, saying that we ought to get into this war. I have been shocked since returning to Washington to find some men in the departments saying that we ought to get into it and ought to make this a short war. I say that the man who says we ought to get into this war and make it a short war or a long war is not worthy of the name "American."

Mr. BURKE. I will say to the Senator from Montana, as I attempted to say to the Senator from Missouri, that if he has any evidence that anyone in an official position in this Government is taking steps preparing us for getting into war he ought to disclose the facts with more definiteness than by the mere expression "some men in the departments." I was here before the Senator from Montana returned to Washington and was about the departments and everywhere that I could go, and I saw no evidence whatever of such a condition.

I would not want to pass over without reference to it, although I shall discuss it later on, the Senator's statement about the shortness of the duration of the war. I agree with him fully that we ought not to go into the war in order to shorten it, but I think it is also indisputably true that the shorter the war in Europe is the less chance there is we will get into it, and that every day that is cut off from the duration of that war means just that much less chance for conditions to develop that might force the sentiment of this country to such a point that even unwilling Senators would say we must go to war. We never can go, we never will go to war, of course, unless the sentiment of the country is in favor of our doing so. However, I propose to discuss that a little later on.

I am glad also for the interruption by the Senator from Montana in his reference to Poland because it gives me opportunity to restate that the only purpose I had in mind in referring to religious and racial persecutions in Germany was, not to draw any contrast between Germany and Poland or any other country, but to call attention to the fact that we have on our statute books now, unwittingly, a law which confers a tremendous and immeasurable benefit upon Germany. I called attention to these persecutions and atrocities as an additional reason why we ought to wipe off our statute books any provision that affords material help in time of war to a nation or to the rulers of a nation guilty of the acts that are properly charged and proven against Hitler and Hitlerism.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, if I may interrupt the Senator again—

Mr. BURKE. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. As I said a while ago, I deplore what was done to the Jews in Germany; but there is to the south a country that persecuted the Catholics far more than they have been persecuted in almost any other country in my generation. No one, however, at that time was saying that, because of that situation we ought to go to war with Mexico or, if there was any such person in the United States he was immediately silenced.

Mr. BURKE. I am not saying now or have I said at any time that we ought to go to war against Germany because of religious and racial persecutions, but I say that if the Senator from Montana was in the United States Senate when the religious persecutions were taking place in Mexico and he did not then rise and, with flaming eloquence, denounce those persecutions, and do his part to arouse the moral indignation of this country and our Government against those responsible for those persecutions, he did not fully measure up to the great responsibilities of his office as he normally does.

Mr. WHEELER. Let me say to the Senator that I think every right-thinking Member of the Senate did deplore what was going on in Mexico, but certainly there was not the slightest indication or suggestion on the part of anyone, either in the Congress of the United States or any of the departments, or from the heads of the Government, that we ought to go to war because of those wrongs.

Mr. BURKE. Oh, no. I emphasize again that I do not say we ought to go to war because of what is happening in Germany. I take it for granted that during the time the troubles referred to were rife in Mexico no one called attention to the fact that we had a statute that was of particular benefit and aid to Mexico in enabling it to proceed in its unholy course of conduct, and that there was no debate in the Senate as to whether we should repeal that statute or continue it in force. That is the only point that I bring up in connection with the matter of religious and racial persecu-

tions in Germany. I have quoted from the very highest authorities as to the Catholic persecutions and the persecution of the Jews. We all know that they exist. Every sensible person, it seems to me, must admit that the arms embargo, in view of conditions that exist in Europe today, is of immeasurable value to Germany in carrying on its conflict. I cannot see why we should hesitate a moment to wipe it off our statute books, even if we cannot go any further than that in our condemnation of the things that Hitlerism has been doing.

It has been the view of American statesmen that we cannot afford to stand idly by while such wrongs are being perpetrated. Our own safety, if nothing else, demands that we express our moral indignation, that we denounce such outrages wherever they show themselves, that we summon the guilty rulers before the bar of public world opinion where they may be held up to the scorn and condemnation of all right-thinking people. Thus only can we make our contribution to the great cause of curbing the evil of racial and religious persecution. It must be clear—and this may be repetition—that whatever we may see fit to do in the way of voicing our condemnation of the acts of persecution and other offenses which have made the term "Hitlerism" odious throughout the civilized world, at least we are under no obligation, in the name of neutrality, to leave on our statute books an arms embargo which is of material aid to him in carrying on the activities which so seriously offend our sense of right—an embargo so favorable to any nation bent on aggression and so detrimental to all others anxious to walk in the paths of peace.

Mr. President, a year ago I visited Germany. I was tremendously impressed with the German people and with the evidences of progress and stability that appeared on every hand. The people I there saw and associated with—there were not included any political leaders or military chieftains—were apparently of the same sturdy stock—clear-eyed, clean-living—as the immigrants who have come from that land in other days in such great number to make their homes in America. I refer to the German immigrants whose toil and genius have contributed so much to the rapid development of this New World. It is not flattery to repeat that of all the races that have mingled in this melting pot that we call the United States, none can justly claim precedence in quality or strength to the German. We have no more patriotic, peace-loving, industrious citizens than these millions of German stock. It is natural and right that they should have a deep and abiding love and affection for the old Germany, their ancestral home. I am confident that they will be found to be as nearly unanimous as any other cross-section of our citizens in their opposition to Nazi excesses, to persecutions based on race and religion, to suppression of freedom of conscience and of personal liberty. From Von Steuben in our Revolutionary struggle, who deservedly stands with Lafayette as a foreign friend of American liberty, down through the noble Carl Schurz to the present time, none will question the marvelous contribution to freedom, culture, art, science, and religion with which Germans have enriched American soil. We have no superior farmers, at least in the section of the country in which I live, no more reliable businessmen; none who have furnished greater inspiration in the field of music, art, letters, and the learned professions. But conditions inside Nazi Germany, however concealed or glossed over there, must be faced and dealt with by American citizens of German ancestry, as well as by all other citizens, as a menace not only to Europe but to our own country and to the very foundations of religion and hence of civilization itself.

On the occasion of my visit to the homeland of these citizens of German blood, I could see ample reason for them to take pride in the country of their fathers. When I returned and expressed that appreciation of what I had seen and experienced, it was at the expense of being accused of defending Hitlerism, the bad along with the good. Unjust as that accusation was, it would be equally unfair today to hold in suspicion our fellow citizens with German blood in their veins. They can—and I am persuaded the vast majority of

them do—distinguish between the German people and the things imposed in the name of Hitlerism. Let no one doubt that the day will come when Germans themselves will take matters into their own hands; when they will put an end to a regime which subordinates the individual to the state, which sanctions religious and racial persecutions, denies God, and recognizes no law but the law of force.

I repeat the first proposition upon which this debate turns. The arms embargo favors Hitlerism. Because I do not approve of what is embodied in that term, the term "Hitlerism," I urge repeal of the embargo. No rule of neutrality requires me to support a domestic law which operates to strengthen a foreign cause which seems to me inimical to all that is just and true and of good repute.

But it is said—and this matter has been fully discussed—that, since war is now under way in Europe, it is not fair to change our own law. There are two answers to that suggestion. In the first place, as has been repeatedly pointed out, all parties were put on notice long before the war started that the arms embargo would be repealed at the first session of Congress if the votes could be secured—and there has never been any real question on that score. It should be noted in passing that there are some who are opposed to repeal who must rely upon other grounds than that war is now under way; for it was their certain assurance that there would be no war that prevented repeal before the actual outbreak occurred.

But there is a second answer to the claim that it is now too late to change our own law. That claim is founded on something resembling the doctrine of estoppel, familiar to all lawyers, and, incidentally, discussed on the floor yesterday by the very able senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN]. That doctrine is, of course, that if you lead another to change his position to his detriment, the circumstances may be such as to estop you from doing what you would otherwise have a perfect right to do. So—and this is the effect of the argument urged—it is in effect suggested that Congress is now estopped to repeal the arms embargo. It was enacted when there was no war in Europe. Hitler had a right to take the operation of that law into account in making up his mind whether he would start a war. He decided, considering our arms embargo and everything else he had to take into consideration, that it was safe for him to do so. So the war began. If we repeal the embargo now, he will suffer the detriment of having arms, ammunition, and implements of war made available to his enemies, and so the well-recognized doctrine of estoppel may be brought into force.

There is no logic or sense to this argument that the outbreak of the war has any bearing upon our right to repeal the embargo, other than lies in the supposition that except for his reliance upon that embargo Hitler might not have run the risk of invading Poland, devastating its cities, and raining wholesale death upon Polish men, women, and children. With our embargo remaining in force, he might have figured that he could crush Britain and France, if they came to Poland's defense, before they would be able to build up their own supplies of arms, ammunition, and implements of war. He knew his own strength, and he knew equally well the unpreparedness of those who might be his enemies.

So, relying, no doubt in part, and perhaps in very heavy part, upon our arms embargo, Hitler crossed the Polish border on his mission of death and destruction. For us now to repeal our embargo—this is the effect of the argument offered—and open the way for his intended victims to arm for their own protection, and to attack and eventually crush him, is not fair. We should be estopped.

The answer is simple. If we foolishly passed a law which encourages aggression such as we have witnessed in the past month, we cannot act too promptly in repealing it. No one had any right to count upon the arms embargo being permitted to stand after its evil consequences were once realized—the premium it offers to an aggressor willing to devote all the energies of his people in preparation for a swift attack while others are following the paths of peace, the handicap it imposes upon every people with a love of peace who refrain as long as possible from entering the mad race

to arms. There is no merit, I say, to the argument that, having passed a vicious law, we must wait until it has wrought to the full its evil consequences before we dare to consider repeal. The matter of surprise to me is that there should be any to rise in defense of a continuation of the embargo.

The first proposition I have outlined is that retention of the arms embargo favors Hitler. I conclude from that statement, which I think cannot be disputed, that we should be unwilling to retain a law which has that effect. Certainly a law which vitally benefits the belligerent solely responsible for commencing a war ought not to be defended on the ground of neutrality.

Second. The second proposition appears equally incontrovertible. Repeal of the arms embargo is difficult to defend on the basis of neutrality, for repeal will certainly favor Great Britain and France. It will favor them at least to the extent of making it possible for them to shorten the duration of the war. It will favor them to the extent of rendering unlikely an inconclusive outcome of the war, with the consequent certainty of an early recurrence. Repeal of the embargo will go far toward insuring victory for the European democracies. There should follow such a victory a just and equitable peace, with the erection of a permanent ban on the spreading by force of totalitarianism over unwilling peoples.

It may be said, I realize, that the embargo as it stands today, is neutral because under it all belligerents are treated alike. None can secure from us completely fabricated arms, ammunition, and implements of war. But it is a mere play on words to say that because the present arms embargo treats all belligerents alike and does not let any of them buy anything from us, therefore it is neutral. Everyone in his heart knows that in reality the entire benefit of this policy inures to one belligerent, and the entire detriment to those on the other side. Moreover, emphasis has already been given to the futility of attempting to discriminate between the raw material, the partly fabricated article, and the completed product. As modern warfare is conducted, it is meaningless to attempt any distinction between classes of goods.

This point was effectively made by Secretary Hull to the committees of Congress last May. He testified—and I should like here to quote two or three sentences from his statement to the committee:

Modern warfare is no longer warfare between armed forces only; it is warfare between nations in every phase of their national life. Lists of contraband are no longer limited to arms and ammunition and closely related commodities. They include not only those items which contribute toward making warfare possible but almost every item useful in the life of the enemy nation. A nation at war is no less anxious to keep cotton or petroleum, or, indeed, any useful product, from reaching an enemy nation than it is to keep guns and airplanes from reaching the enemy's armed forces. I doubt whether we can help ourselves to keep out of war by an attempt on our part to distinguish between categories of exports.

Further, the point has been made that while under the embargo we refuse to sell arms directly to a belligerent, there is no feasible method by which we can be sure that shipments to neutrals—real or self-styled—will not find their way into enemy hands. As long as the embargo stands, we must not permit any of the prohibited articles to reach Canada, a belligerent. But since Italy and Russia are, by their own contention at least, in the class of neutrals, shipments of arms may be freely made to them. What happens thereafter we have little possibility of checking.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. BURKE. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Before the Senator passes from the very fine point which I thought he intended elaborating, does he care to express an opinion as to whether it was the absence and shortage of wheat, or of arms and ammunition, which contributed the more to the eventual defeat of Germany in the World War?

Mr. BURKE. My own opinion on that subject is very clear—I do not know how authentic it is—that it was the

absence of food supplies that brought the German people themselves, a great many of whom I have no doubt never did believe in the war, to realize the lack of wisdom and the futility of continuing to support what their leaders had forced them into. In direct answer to the question of the Senator from Florida, I will say that it was the lack of wheat, as fully as the lack of bullets, that ended the World War.

Likewise, from the other standpoint, it may be argued that repeal of the embargo, with substitution of cash and carry, treats all belligerents alike, and is, therefore, in accord with the principle of neutrality. So far as we are concerned, any belligerent may, when the substitute joint resolution is enacted, come with its own vessels, with cash in hand, and buy anything we have for sale. Title will pass on our shores after payment in full, the present little flurry about 90-day commercial credits having in the meanwhile been satisfactorily worked out, of course.

But this argument, also, is sham. Everyone knows that the belligerents do not have the same capacity to cross the seas, pay for their purchases, and carry them away in their own vessels. Repeal of the arms embargo will, therefore, not operate equally. To defend repeal upon that ground alone does not carry conviction.

For myself, I have crossed that bridge. I speak no more of repeal of the arms embargo as an expression of strict neutrality, for it is not that. It checks the belligerent who now has a great advantage, takes that advantage away, and checks the belligerent which I, speaking for myself personally, want checked. It favors the belligerents that I want favored, by giving them the chance of coming here with their ships and buying our goods. However, I base my defense of repeal not on these preferences. We should repeal the arms embargo and adopt the other provisions of the substitute, with some minor modifications, because such action will greatly further the best interests of the United States. That brings me to my third and final proposition.

Third. Enactment of the Pittman substitute, with its repeal of the arms embargo, establishment of cash and carry on all goods sold to belligerents, and the imposition of reasonable restrictions on American shipping, will further the best interests of our country. There are many reasons why this is so. I shall now set forth a few of them.

First, this policy gives the largest measure of assurance attainable that we will not become involved in the war.

There is no doubt of the overwhelming desire of Americans to remain out of war. I respect the views of all who differ from me as to the best method of accomplishing that end. At the same time, I resent the statement or implication by anyone that those with whom they do not agree are trying to take us into war. As matters stand today, there is not the remotest possibility that we will ever send another American expeditionary force to Europe. Certainly no person of sense wants to do that or desires that this country should take any direct part in the war that is now under way or in any foreign war.

It is whispered that the President is consciously moving in the direction of war, that Secretary Hull is favorable to such a course, that some Senators and others are willing that such action should follow. That is calumny of the basest sort.

Mr. MINTON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. BURKE. I yield.

Mr. MINTON. The Senator from Nebraska has heard it charged on the floor of the Senate this afternoon that some Senators are advocating such a course, and that officials in the departments are likewise advocating it. Does the Senator from Nebraska know of any Senators who are advocating such a course in this country?

Mr. BURKE. I do not know of a single Senator, Representative, or anyone connected with the executive department or any other department of the Government who advocates in any way that this country should enter the war. I would say, to be entirely frank, that I have heard some discussion to the effect that conditions might at some time become so bad in Europe, or in other parts of the world,

that, for our own protection, we might have to engage in war; but not a single person in the Senate or outside of it, connected with the Government, have I heard express the slightest wish or thought that this country should be, or is in any present danger of being, drawn into the war. I thank the Senator for his interruption.

Mr. President, we are justified in proceeding on the assumption that Congress, the Chief Executive, all of our people, are united in a common purpose to protect the safety and integrity of our country and keep us out of war. How is the pending measure adapted to secure that result?

First, by going to extreme lengths in keeping American ships, American citizens, and American goods out of danger zones. This proposition has been so thoroughly discussed that I shall not repeat the arguments. Certainly the pending measure affords the greatest insurance against involvement in war that any nation in the history of the world has undertaken. But, it will be said, we can do all of that with respect to everything except arms, and leave the embargo in force on arms. The difficulty of distinguishing between classes of goods has been pointed out. It is a meaningless and futile distinction as war is conducted today. It would lead to endless complications. In fact, so great are the difficulties that careful study of the matter leads me to the conclusion that it would be far better to impose a complete embargo upon all trade with belligerents than differentiate between different classes of goods and say, "These particular goods are under an embargo. We will not let them get into your hands. These other goods over here you can buy and pay for and take title to them in this country"; then in between a great mass of goods, requiring every day and every hour some official of the Government to determine whether they come in the one class or the other, with constant trouble and difficulty—so great trouble that, far better than adopt the suggestion now offered by those who, in the first place, hoping to defeat the arms embargo without any concession now come forward and say, "We can have cash-and-carry provisions and everything else just so you leave the arms embargo." Rather than do that, I think we will avoid trouble by putting a complete embargo on everything so far as belligerents are concerned.

We all recognize that if we imposed such a complete embargo it would disrupt our entire economy, and that there are other objections to it.

So we support the sensible, clear, easily enforced substitute of applying the cash-and-carry formula to all sales to all belligerents.

Second, repeal of the arms embargo will shorten the war. I have no doubt that in the end the democracies will prevail in their struggle against the totalitarian powers, whatever action we take. But without repeal it may easily be a long-drawn-out war, costly in human life and in the destruction of the accumulated values of centuries of effort. Moreover, the longer the war lasts the greater the danger of our involvement. Every day that the war is shortened means just that much less possibility of our participation.

It has been said here by opponents of repeal that the action which it is proposed to take will be interpreted abroad as casting our lot with the Allies. No doubt it will be so interpreted within the limits which we lay down, but I say that the effect will be a far earlier peace than could otherwise be secured. Not only will it hearten the democracies of Europe, not only will it be a clear demonstration to the Nazi and communistic powers that they have more to contend against than they had anticipated, but it will strengthen the courage and the hope of all neutral nations of Europe and the world that this country does not propose under the name of neutrality to permit a law to stand on its books which is so greatly favoring the aggressor nations in this struggle in Europe.

Our sympathies, our moral support, our material help within the restrictions imposed, everything that we can do short of supplying men and money, should be done on the side of the Allies as the most helpful means of bringing an early termination of the war with a just and lasting peace.

Repeal of the arms embargo is vital to our national defense. We have the benefit of two oceans. But in this day an expanse of water does not begin to afford the protection it did in former times. Although we have spent enormous sums on our Navy, we are far from having adequate strength to cover both oceans. It will require years of time and a further and continuous vast expenditure to build up our defenses on water to the point where we can feel secure. Meanwhile, we have no cause for alarm while the Navy of Great Britain remains intact. By submarine and air there is today a serious threat to the continuation of the supremacy of England on the sea. Our own national defense, our continued security, require that Great Britain retain its position of leadership. This argument does not require for its support that there be any love of the British Empire or any purpose to help keep it intact. It may be based on thoroughly selfish grounds. It calls only for a comparison of our security and the integrity of the Western Hemisphere with England dominant on the seas or with England reduced to subservience and a Nazi-Communist alliance ruling the Atlantic.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. BURKE. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I will ask the Senator this question: If Great Britain were to begin to embrace the same doctrine and the same philosophy and begin to adopt the same course that the German Nation has followed under Hitlerism, would not the Senator from Nebraska be saying exactly the same thing about the British Empire that he is now saying about Hitlerism?

Mr. BURKE. I would, most certainly, and I am very sure that the Senator from Florida would be standing there right by my side and helping me to say it effectively. We certainly would take that attitude.

Mr. President, if no other reason existed, I would favor repeal of the arms embargo in order to make doubly sure that the British Navy will continue to stand between us and forces in Europe that I do not trust or respect.

There is a second way in which repeal will aid our national defense. The belligerents that will come to us to purchase arms, ammunition, and implements of war—to pay for them and carry them away in their own vessels and at their own risk—will not receive the only or the chief benefit from that transaction. We will be enabled thereby so to enlarge and develop our facilities for the production of those items essential to our national defense, within proper rules and regulations prohibiting excessive profits and making impossible the development of a boom in munitions manufacture, the collapse of which would cause trouble, that we can make our country impregnable in the air, on land, and at least so long as the British Navy remains intact, on the sea.

Failure to repeal the embargo now would mean that we have determined upon a permanent national policy of that character. It would be notice to every country on earth committed to aggression and war as a means of attaining desired objectives that their prospective victims could never purchase weapons of defense from us. It would be notice to every country that prefers peace that it must arm itself completely, because the moment an aggressor sets foot upon its soil nothing could be purchased from us with which to defend itself from attack.

There is much idle talk and foolish sentiment about the immorality of the traffic in arms, and of our participation in guilt if we place weapons in the hands of others which they may use with deadly effect. That all depends upon whose hands it is in which we place the weapons and the purpose for which they are to be used. If we arm a murderer certainly we are parties to any crime he may commit. If we arm an officer of the law to defend our homes and our loved ones we are acting in accordance with the highest principles of morality. If we were to help to arm an aggressor nation and were to refuse to aid with arms the intended victim, then our guilt would, indeed, be great. If by selling arms to nations that are risking everything in the cause, we can aid in the struggle to restrain and hold within bounds

the spread of nazi-ism and communism, then I am willing to share whatever guilt anyone may choose to say is involved in such a course.

Mr. President, on that point, as to the sentiments expressed with regard to the "immorality" of repealing the embargo on arms, ammunition, and implements of war, I have a letter from my home State of Nebraska which I should like to read, as well as my answer:

DEAR SENATOR BURKE: * * * This world, after all, is not so large. Suppose that, for the sake of illustration, we think of the farmers of some certain community as representing the nations of the earth.

We will represent three of these farmers by the letters A, B, and C. Now suppose that farmers A and B have a heated dispute concerning a line fence. After the argument farmer A drives over to neighbor C, where he tells about his trouble and offers him a good price for his shotgun and some shells with which he intends to kill neighbor B. Farmer C replies, "It's a deal if you will pay me the cash." Farmer A also makes a purchase of some kerosene with which to set fire to neighbor B's house and he buys some poison to put in candy to give to neighbor B's children because he does not like their father.

We do not do things halfway in Nebraska; we go the whole way. [Laughter.]

After farmer A drives out of C's yard farmer B comes in and tells neighbor C that farmer A and his family should be wiped off of the face of the earth. He offers and pays farmer C a good price for his 30-30 rifle, some shells, kerosene, and what was left of the poison.

Now, Senator BURKE, can you feature a single individual in the entire State of Nebraska outside of an insane asylum who, knowing what his neighbors intended to use this equipment for, would willingly sell it to them? It seems to me, Senator, that this is just exactly the kind of a person that you are making out of the United States of America if you permit the arms embargo to be lifted.

I have jotted down here the answer I made:

We take your characters, farmers A, B, and C. Farmer A, as the result of economic distress, ill health, perverseness of human nature, or whatever the cause may be, becomes demented. He meets farmer B and tells him that the next day at noon he is going to farmer B's house, fully armed, and with a few hoodlums to help him, that he and his associates are going to kill farmer B, assault his wife and daughter, and burn his house and barn. Farmer B tells farmer C that he has followed the paths of peace, that he has no arms, neither rifle, shotgun, or pistol. That he knows farmer A is supplied with all the things necessary to carry out his dire threat. Farmer B pleads with farmer C to sell him for cash, or loan him, the arms with which to defend himself, his loved ones, and his property.

My dear Mr. —, can you feature a single citizen in Nebraska outside of an insane asylum who would not willingly furnish farmer B the means of defending the things that are dearest in life to him? Do you think farmer C would be deterred from so doing because of the probability that farmer A would consider his act unneutral?

Mr. President, it seems to me there is no merit whatever in either illustration, and by the same token there is a complete lack of merit in all the loose talk that is indulged about the crime of placing instruments of death in the hands of another people; a crime to give the means of defense to a people who are defending their liberties, defending the lives of themselves and their families and their property, everything they hold dear. I say it is anything but a crime.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURKE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. If we are to base the discussion of the question of the arms embargo or the sale of arms on the ground of immorality—that is, that it is immoral to permit the sale of such arms—can it be said that it is any more immoral to sell arms than it is to buy arms, because one who buys them is in all likelihood the first who will use them?

Mr. BURKE. He is certainly tarred with the same stick.

Mr. BARKLEY. And if our Nation were attacked by an aggressor, in which case we needed to buy arms from some other nation in order to defend ourselves, is there a Senator or any other American citizen who would take the position that it would be immoral for the United States to buy arms wherever we could find them? And does the fact that we do not need them and that we are powerful have any effect whatever upon the question of the morality or the immorality of the transaction?

Mr. BURKE. I think the Senator's point is well taken. I think it would be possible for us to go one step further and say that if it is immoral to sell arms, it is certainly, as the

Senator says, immoral to buy them. Why is it not equally immoral, perhaps even more so, to make arms, to make any death-dealing weapons of any kind? And yet is there a Senator who has not voted at every session of Congress enormous appropriations for the very purpose of making instruments of death—these terrible things that we must not permit to come into the hands of people defending their liberties?

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURKE. I yield.

Mr. ADAMS. In respect to the inquiry whether there is immorality in the sale of death-dealing implements, it would seem to me that it is fully as immoral to sell them in times of peace as in times of war; and I may add that if it was immoral to sell munitions on the 3d of September, it was immoral to sell them on the 1st of September. In other words, under the present situation it was proper for us to sell munitions to Poland when they were not needed, and immoral to sell them to Poland when she was invaded.

Mr. BURKE. Certainly. The Senator from Colorado is absolutely correct.

Mr. MINTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURKE. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. MINTON. The Senator has been interrupted so many times I hesitate to interrupt him but shall do so once more. I know how difficult it is to make an analogy that fits all questions on all fours. The Senator has been making an able statement with respect to what may be called unneutrality on the part of our country. I wonder if an illustration would not depict the so-called unneutrality in our position, an illustration of men engaged in mortal combat, which has been used by the Senator from Nebraska and by others in the debate. Suppose two men were in mortal combat, and one of them was armed and he drew his weapon and started in pursuit of the other man. Suppose the other man started to retreat and retreated near where the Senator was sitting; that a weapon of the Senator's was near; and that in defense of his life the man being pursued reached for the Senator's weapon, but before he could grasp it the Senator pulled it away and said, "No; you cannot defend yourself with my weapon."

Mr. BURKE. I wish the Senator would select someone else to pull the weapon away, because I certainly would not do so.

Mr. MINTON. Is not that the way our so-called Neutrality Act operates? Nations are engaged in mortal combat. One of them is well prepared for the fight, and is pursuing its enemy, who comes to our shores and reaches for a weapon. Under the embargo we say, "No; you cannot fight back with our weapons."

Mr. BURKE. I think the illustration is very apt, and brings out the complete fallacy in the argument which has been offered on the other side.

Mr. President, no further argument by me is required to make my position clear.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. BURKE. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator has been interrupted so often that I dislike to interrupt him again; but in reference to the immorality or the morality feature, I happen to recall, being a member of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate, that this year Congress has appropriated more than \$1,000,000,000 for the purpose of killing people in war, if necessary. We have appropriated for the Army and Navy more than \$1,000,000,000 for the purpose of killing people.

Mr. BURKE. Possibly there is no immorality about it if we make it completely selfish.

Mr. McKELLAR. If it is completely selfish, there is no immorality; but if we sell the arms or materials to other nations, it is immoral. I do not see the distinction.

Mr. BURKE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I hate war and everything connected with it. I long for the day when universal peace will prevail, and will strive unceasingly to hasten the coming of that day. I am opposed to nazi-ism and communism, and am

fully convinced that the future well-being of the world, including that of America, requires that a curb be placed upon those false philosophies.

I find that a law for which I voted, in the fond hope that it would aid in preserving peace, now affords comfort and strength to the enemies of peace. Therefore, I urge repeal of that unneutral act. I do not contend that by so doing, by taking away benefits which our law unwittingly gives to one belligerent and conferring them upon the other, we are acting in the role of neutrality. As matters have developed, it is impossible for us to be neutral. If we do nothing, we favor one side. If we take the proposed action, we favor the other.

Under those circumstances, we should determine what course will more likely advance the security and the integrity of our own country. What course will bring peace more quickly? What course will be best adapted to keep us from involvement in the war? What course will aid our national defense most surely as the greatest assurance that we shall never be called upon to use force to defend our rights? I find that all of these desirable ends can best be attained by the immediate repeal of the arms embargo, strict adherence to cash and carry, and the imposition of whatever restrictions may be necessary so that American ships, American citizens, and American goods will not be exposed to unnecessary danger. I therefore give my hearty support to the Pittman measure, which is built upon that solid foundation.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURKE. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator from Nebraska. I have sat here most interested, listening to the very frank statement of the position of the Senator from Nebraska, and have been unwilling to interrupt. However, I wish the Senator would be kind enough to point out wherein in the joint resolution he finds the section which he describes as requiring a cash-and-carry policy.

Mr. BURKE. Is the Senator directing my attention to the 90-day commercial transaction clause?

Mr. DANAHER. No. I ask wherein, in any feature of the joint resolution, the Senator from Nebraska finds a cash-and-carry provision.

Mr. BURKE. In reference to all the provisions?

Mr. DANAHER. In reference to the fact that, as the Senator concluded, he said he was in favor of the strict cash-and-carry provisions of the Pittman measure. I ask, Where are they?

Mr. BURKE. Without having the joint resolution before me, I cannot refer to the exact provisions; but I will direct the Senator's attention to them. He has read them word for word. Does not the joint resolution provide for the passage of title to goods in this country sold to belligerents?

Mr. DANAHER. It does.

Mr. BURKE. What does that involve?

Mr. DANAHER. I want to know if the Senator was basing his remarks with respect to cash and carry on section 2 (c), which appears on page 16, which is the provision which has to do with the passage of title.

Mr. BURKE. That is certainly one of the provisions. If the Senator will tell me what he has in mind, I am sure the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] can answer the question.

Mr. DANAHER. I shall be very happy if I may have the answer from the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. BURKE. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, section 2, subsection (c), provides for the transfer of title to foreigners. There is no question there with regard to the financial transaction. However, turning to section 7 (a), we find the financial transactions referred to. Section 7 (a) is the existing law. It states that—

Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under the authority of section 1 (a), it shall thereafter be unlawful for any person within the United States to purchase, sell, or exchange bonds, securities, or other obligations of the government of any state named in such proclamation, or of any political subdivision of

any such state, or of any person acting for or on behalf of the government of any such state, issued after the date of such proclamation, or to make any loan or extend any credit to any such government, political subdivision, or person.

That is the existing law, and has been the law since 1937.

Mr. CONNALLY. The 90-day provision was not in the old law.

Mr. PITTMAN. Just one moment. That provision was adopted, as the Senator from Michigan has boasted, by a vote of 63 to 6. But that was not all of the law for which Senators, including the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], voted. Here is the rest of the law:

Provided, That if the President shall find that such action will serve to protect the commercial or other interests of the United States or its citizens, he may, in his discretion, and to such extent and under such regulations as he may prescribe, except from the operation of this section ordinary commercial credits and short-time obligations in aid of legal transactions and of a character customarily used in normal peacetime commercial transactions.

That is the end of the existing law. That is the law today, because there is no law to take its place. That provision was adopted by a vote of 63 to 6. It is the law today. Does the Senator wish to know what law is proposed?

Mr. DANAHER. I wish to know to what provisions the Senator from Nebraska referred as those dealing with the cash-and-carry clause. We come now, I take it, specifically—

Mr. BURKE. Mr. President, I yielded for a question, but I think that is a discussion which could very well go on at some other time. I therefore withdraw my yielding, and now surrender the floor.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I am very sorry. I thought the Senator had finished.

Mr. WHITE obtained the floor.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, may I have it noted in the Record that the question propounded by me has not been answered? The Senator from Nebraska having yielded to the Senator from Nevada for the purpose of answering the question, I had assumed, of course, that we were still discussing the matter in the time of the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I thought the Senator from Nebraska had concluded, or I should not have thought of interrupting him.

Mr. DANAHER. I thought the Senator from Nebraska had turned the question over to the Senator from Nevada for an answer, which is yet in process.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine yield to me for a moment?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Connecticut rose and asked the Senator from Nebraska to yield for a question, which the Senator did before yielding the floor. While holding the floor, the Senator from Nebraska suggested that the answer to the question could be more appropriately made by the Senator from Nevada, continuing to hold the floor; but, inasmuch as the matter developed into a discussion of some length, the Senator from Nebraska withdrew from the floor.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I purpose to speak at this time upon only two phases of the problem before the Senate, to voice my great concern as to the effects of the pending measure upon these two aspects of the general subject. I have given anxious thought to them; and though what I say may be in the form of affirmative statement, I beg Senators to believe, and I especially beg the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate to believe, that I am voicing questions which disturb me, questions to which I hope I shall, at an appropriate time, receive satisfying answers.

I have been influenced in my decision as to the pending bill in its present draft, first, by a passionate desire to keep our country from war; second, by a fervent hope that Britain and France will prevail in their righteous cause. The latter hope, however, is wholly subservient to my dominant yearning that America shall continue to enjoy peace.

Our people, I believe, almost as one hope for French victory because of our country's traditional friendship of a century and a half with this sister republic. Many of our people wish for British victory because of blood, of language,

of history and tradition, because of our common law and the common political ideals of America and of England. They see in the law and life of England, in a degree found in no other power in Europe, loyalty to those liberties which we enjoy. All Americans, I hope and believe, regard Hitlerism as a denial of every political principal to which we are attached. They fear that the triumph of Hitlerism must threaten freedom of men everywhere, and the perpetuity of those political institutions that are our American glory.

I share these sentiments. I would have America sympathetic with the purposes for which Britain and France have gone to battle, but I would not have our United States involved in European politics; I would not send our youth to war in alien lands; and we may best assure these American interests and the hopes of our people by making certain that no acts or defaults of ours contribute to the enemies of our beliefs.

Mr. President, of the 531 Members of the present Congress, if my checking is correct, but 41 were serving in the Sixty-fifth Congress at the time the state of war was declared to exist between this country and the Imperial German Government. Of this number, 19 only are now Members of the Senate of the United States. I am one of this small group. In 1917 I cast my vote for war. All the years that have passed have not lifted from me the shadows of that vote, of the ghastly tragedy and the pitiful futility of that war. No man, unless one of those who actively participated in and experienced the horrors of that conflict, can hate war more than do I, can be more painfully anxious than am I to find and to follow that course which will spare us like days of sacrifice and suffering.

I oppose the joint resolution before us in its pending form because it does not, in my view, contribute to these hopes so near my heart. Its enactment and its administration may well prejudice the cause of the peoples of the world; and it puts in jeopardy, in greater degree than present law, the peace of the United States.

How does it adversely affect the democracies of Europe? Present law forbids the exportation to belligerents of arms, ammunition, and implements of war. It does not interfere with the movement to belligerents in either foreign or American vessels of a thousand and one other things of civilian and military usefulness. It is at most a limited embargo. What do we propose in its stead? A law of greater restriction upon exports to the Allies.

We authorize, in the letter of the legislation now under consideration, the shipment of arms, ammunition, and implements of war if carried in foreign ships, if title has first passed, and if cash is paid. We offer in reality but a narrowly limited and a temporary relaxation of the existing embargo; for if this war is prolonged—and the cause of liberty cannot shortly prevail against the organized resources of autocracy—this source of strength to the Allies will speedily wane. Their credits in this country will be soon exhausted; for those now existent must meet not alone the cost of munitions but the cost of all other essential supplies upon which the civilian populations and the armies of France and Britain must rely. They cannot pay in goods, for they cannot in wartime produce them. They could not transport them to us if goods desired by us were produced by them. They cannot pay in gold, for this would mean the further depletion of their already exhausted stocks, and would lead to dangerous inflation. They cannot pay in services. They cannot, in truth, long pay at all in cash or with present credits. We must, therefore, soon cease to be the source of their supply of munitions and of all other necessities. This denial of credits, all considered, is an added restriction upon the movement of essential commodities to Britain and France.

Next to be noted in the consideration of this problem is the prohibition in the pending bill against American ships entering combat areas. These danger areas will embrace the waters around neutral nations. They will include the waters around Spain, Portugal, Belgium, Holland, Denmark, Finland, Norway, and Sweden. The ports of every nation now neutral, within a thousand miles of Britain, will be

closed to our ships, and the possibility will be gone of articles and materials of whatever kind reaching France and Britain by indirect water routes from America. So, while by this provision of law we shall cut Britain and France from the aid they might receive under present law, Germany will continue to avail herself by land, as she is now arranging to do, of the vast resources of Russia and Central Europe. In substantial measure we close the seas, its sole avenue of trade, to Britain, while land routes continue open to Germany. This constitutes a further portentous difficulty to be faced and overcome by Britain and France.

Then, Mr. President, to complete the strangulation of these two nations, it is proposed to prohibit American ships from carrying to them directly any articles or materials whatsoever. By present law our vessels may transport all articles and materials except arms, ammunition, and implements of war; they may carry a multitude of other things which combatants and noncombatants alike must have. We now are to deny this right of purchase and transportation.

What must the result be? It must be a still further restriction of opportunity, a further denial of supplies to the Allies, France and Britain.

In the last war Britain had more ships than she has today, yet she and her Allies, with the aid of all the neutral maritime nations of the world, could not then meet the problem of transportation of vital supplies. With the withdrawal of many foreign ships, we saw our docks and warehouses, the terminals of our great ports, and freight cars stretching for miles into the interior filled to overflowing with the products of the farms, the forests, the mines, and the factories of America, and we saw moved to the markets of the world only those things which belligerents were able and willing to take.

With no American ships in the foreign trade, and with foreign vessels not freely available, the rate on cotton consigned to Liverpool mounted from 35 cents per 100 pounds to \$11, on wheat from 8 cents to \$1.36 per bushel, on flour from 10 cents to \$1 per hundredweight, and general cargo rates moved to 10 times their normal figure. Today 213 American ships, of more than 1,438,000 tons, are in the service of belligerent ports, and we are now asked through the pending measure to remove them therefrom and to deprive the democracies of their services and of the supplies essential to their success now carried by these vessels.

The want of American ships in the last war and the inability of the Allies to adequately meet their transportation needs were the immediate occasion of our vast shipbuilding program of war days, during which we constructed approximately 2,500 ships, of ten and one-quarter million tons, and at a cost of three and one-half billion dollars.

The senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] yesterday stated to the Senate that in the 30 months between the outbreak of the World War and January 1917 less than 10 percent of American exports to the then Allies were armaments covered by our present embargo law, the law which it is proposed to repeal. It follows, then, that 90 percent of these enormous exports were articles and materials which, under our existing law, American vessels could legally transport. There is no suggestion that these proportions have changed or would undergo change in the future.

We have, then, the proposition to substitute for this present situation the right in foreign ships to carry 10 percent of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, and the denial to American ships of the right to transport either this 10 percent or the 90 percent of legitimate commerce. And we call that lifting an embargo. If we take from the service of belligerent ports this approximate million and one-half tons of American vessels now sailing to them, Britain and France will again face and will feel even more acutely those shortages which tried their souls a quarter of a century ago. Today Britain and France need these American ships infinitely more than they needed them in the days of the World War.

If we in America wish to announce to the world that we are withdrawing our ships in order to lessen our risks, we shall be

offering a reason, if not a justification, for our course; but when we offer the legislation before us with the avowed purpose of repealing the present embargo, with the expressed intent of withdrawing present alleged transportation advantage from Germany, and of making available to the sea powers the advantage which is their natural right because of their geographical location on the sea, we are indulging in pretense which does violence to the facts of the situation.

Mr. President, I think it should be the privilege of the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], chairman of the Commerce Committee of this body, to first discuss, as fully as he wishes, the effects of the pending measure upon the American merchant marine and upon the efforts of the Congress in behalf thereof. I yield my inclination to express my views thereon to his first right and to his surpassing ability. I avail myself of this opportunity only to express my conviction that in this proposed legislation we are depriving American business and agriculture of their export market; we are preventing our people from receiving those import necessities which come in American bottoms from belligerent ports and from neutral nations as well, all with resulting disruption of our domestic economy; we are adopting a policy which, if persisted in, must keep from the Allies their life-giving supplies, a policy which in time must prove their undoing.

Mr. President, I am not advised as to the origin of this abject proposal of surrender of American rights, this cruel withdrawal of the opportunity of Britain and France to obtain sustaining supplies. I only know that it is not urged in the public recommendations of our Secretary of State; that there is not authority for it, so far as I am aware, in any public statement, written or oral, of the President. I cannot bring myself to make contribution to such consequences.

The second reason for my opposition to the pending measure as now drafted is my conviction that it violates our neutrality and, in its enactment, is a greater threat to our peace than there can be in present law.

Today we are a neutral nation. By statute passed in days of peace we restricted the rights of our nationals and we announced to the world our rule of conduct in the event of war. We now propose, war existing, to alter both the rights of our own people and these world relationships as well. Authorities disagree as to the right of a neutral nation to do the latter. I believe the weight of American and British authority is that such action in such circumstances constitutes a breach of neutrality.

I pass over that controversial question without argument, but with the observation that I cannot accept as valid the suggestion now made that the introduction in the Congress of legislation designed to modify the previously existing world relationships is authoritative notice of a purpose to change these relationships, and that thereby they are changed. The intent of the Congress is found in its completed acts, not in the abortive purpose of some Members of the Congress. As the record stands, one branch of the Congress passed a bill including an embargo and the other branch failed to act at all. Never before has it been insisted that the refusal or the failure, as you please, to act in one session, was notice of an intent to act in any particular manner or to act at all in a later session. The only logical conclusion to be drawn from the inaction of last July is that there were not then available the necessary votes to bring action. This is the only notice given to the world.

Mr. President, I believe that all writers and students agree that impartiality is the very heart of neutrality. Partiality is a contradiction of neutrality. When a statute speaks in terms of partiality and when partiality follows from its application, there is no neutrality. We have before us a measure which forbids an American ship to carry any articles or materials whatsoever to belligerent states, but with the express exception that American vessels may transport anything and everything to Canada, one of the belligerents. This exception is partial in its terms as between the belligerent nations. It is partial in its purpose. It will be partial in its effects. It assures sympathy and material aid

to one of the belligerents. The only justification urged in its behalf is that there is no risk to us involved in such a statute and in the action authorized.

Mr. President, the absence of risk to a nation in its course of action is not the touchstone of neutrality. If we enact the proposed legislation as now written, we make cause with a single belligerent. We justify the charge that we have become a participant in the conflict. I should have greater respect for our position if we frankly declared that to be our purpose. I cannot, however, believe that to be respect for neutrality or the path to a more assured peace.

Mr. President, the pending joint resolution professes to repeal an existing embargo law. It does so in the letter, but in its substance it imposes more onerous restrictions upon our ancient rights of free shipment, and militates directly against belligerents wholly dependent upon sea transportation, those belligerents to whom America's sympathy goes out. It makes pretense of respect for our neutral obligations, but it is unneutral in that it gives aid to one belligerent and denies like aid to all other belligerents. It makes no contribution to our peace that is not overbalanced by this provocation of partiality and participation in behalf of a single belligerent. It speaks in terms of cowardly abandonment of rights, a surrender without precedent in our national life.

Mr. President, for all these reasons I am constrained to vote against the proposed legislation in its present form. My final action will depend upon the final form of the joint resolution.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 27 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, October 12, 1939, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 11, 1939

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful God, as Thy children, we supplicate a Father's blessing. Like streams of water in a dry and thirsty land, so have been Thy benedictions. To Thee we lift our grateful hearts, for Thou art not far from us at any time; may we set them before Thee to be chastened. Enable us, dear Lord, to apply our days unto wisdom, for we know how the fortunes of life change. Melody of song becomes the voice of lamentation; falling tears take the place of happy laughter; the strong become ill; and the joy of life is turned to aching grief. O Divine One, help us not to be cast down, for as our day is so shall our strength be. Oh, may the vision never fade nor the inner light fail. Spread Thy covering wings around till all our hardships cease. In the blessed name of Jesus. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. J. Res. 384. Joint resolution to make provision for certain expenses incident to the second session of the Seventy-sixth Congress.

JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President for his approval a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 384. Joint resolution to make provision for certain expenses incident to the second session of the Seventy-sixth Congress.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, on last evening a speech was delivered in New York City before the Foreign Trade Convention by my fellow townsman and distinguished predecessor, the Honorable Cordell Hull, Secretary of State, which is so typical, in its wisdom and in its unswerving devotion to a sincere conviction, of that eminent southern gentleman, who has no peer in statesmanship in the world today, that I ask leave to extend my remarks and to include it therein.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Hull's speech is as follows:

NEW PROBLEMS IN OUR COMMERCIAL AND FINANCIAL RELATIONS WITH OTHER NATIONS

Less than a year ago, when I had the pleasure of addressing the last National Foreign Trade Convention, the minds of all of us were preoccupied with the ominous increase of tension among nations in several parts of the earth, which was fast darkening the world horizon. We were all acutely conscious of the imperative need of doing everything possible to decrease international tension and to strengthen the forces of peace.

Unfortunately, these efforts failed. For nearly 6 weeks now, the red flames of war have been raging in the heart of the European Continent. No one can tell how much of what mankind holds most precious will be destroyed before the conflagration subsides, nor what remnants of foundations upon which to rebuild civilization and progress will remain.

In this new situation our first and most sacred task is to keep our country secure and at peace. Toward the accomplishment of that task, our Government is devoting every ounce of energy and vigilance. We are happy that the other American republics are equally determined, together with us, to ward off war from the shores of the Western Hemisphere.

It is my firm belief that we will succeed in this endeavor, and that our nations will not be engulfed in the catastrophe of war. Yet, even though we remain at peace, we cannot escape the far-reaching consequences of a widespread major war.

Within the lifetime of most of us a great war was fought. Its fearful effects and repercussions are indelibly impressed upon our memories. Its disastrous aftermath is still before us in sharp relief.

We have witnessed the stupendous difficulties involved in restoring the order of peace out of the chaos of war, and the price which mankind must pay for failure to give proper direction to efforts of reconstruction after a period of protracted hostilities. The most striking feature of the two decades which elapsed between the outbreak of the present war in Europe and the termination of the last, was the widespread and appalling disregard of those fundamentals in the relations among nations upon which alone the work of reconstruction could successfully be carried out.

In no phase of life was this failure to recognize fundamental conditions and requirements more pronounced than in the field of international economic relations. Only through vigorous and healthy trade was it possible for the nations of the world to utilize to the utmost the natural resources of our globe and the unceasing progress of modern science and technology for the purpose of making good the destruction wrought by the war and of laying the foundations for the future advancement of the human race. Instead, by entering upon the road of narrow nationalism, by building up a constantly extending network of trade restrictions, by forcing trade away from the channels of natural advantage, the nations of the world not only failed to correct the profound maladjustments bequeathed by the war, but created new and even more profound dislocations.

These maladjustments and dislocations were in large measure responsible for the unprecedented economic crisis which struck the world with the impact of a hurricane at the end of the 1920's. And even then, instead of reversing the direction of their policies, most nations merely intensified their suicidal movement toward narrow economic nationalism.

The inevitable consequence was that world production was held back, purchasing power within and among nations was impaired, and the human race was forced to subsist on a level of material welfare far below that which was practicable and feasible on the basis of an intelligent organization of international economic relations. Narrow economic nationalism contributed greatly, in recent years, to a weakening of social stability within nations, and to a growing deterioration of morality in international relations. Out of these conditions sprang the roots of the present armed conflict.

As we now enter upon a new period of widespread war, to be followed, sooner or later, by a new period of reconstruction, we should constantly keep before us the lessons of the sad experience of the past quarter of a century. In the economic field, two sets of problems confront us today. The first involves the conduct of our commercial and general economic relations with other nations during the war itself. The second relates to the task of preparation for the reconstruction effort after the termination of hostilities.

In dealing with the first of these two sets of problems, it is necessary to distinguish between three areas: The belligerent nations, the neutral nations outside the Western Hemisphere, and the American nations. In each case, there are certain consequences which we have no choice but to accept, and certain considerations which should guide our policy and action.

Our trade and general economic relations with the belligerents must, of necessity, be governed by two primary factors: The vital requirements of our position as a neutral, and the exigencies of the war situation. The first of these factors imposes upon us, as our wisest and safest course, nonparticipation in the conflict, and an impartial attitude toward the two groups of antagonists. Such a course of true neutrality leaves us entirely free to trade in all commodities with both sides, within such limitations as may be legitimately introduced by the belligerents under the rules of war, and within the further limitations of whatever measures we may wisely choose to adopt for the purpose of eliminating or reducing the risk of danger to our nationals, goods, and ships. The second factor has already caused, and will cause increasingly in the future, substantial changes in the direction and composition of our trade with the nations at war.

From the very outset of the present war, the belligerents have begun to subject their foreign trade to rigorous government controls, which have already far surpassed in comprehensiveness and thoroughness the regulations put into force during the earlier period of the last war. The drastic restriction by the belligerents of imports unessential to the prosecution of hostilities, and their concentration on imports needed for war will place before our exporting industries serious problems of adjustment. Whether the net result of these factors will be an increase or a decrease of our total exports to Europe, no one can tell at this moment. Whatever the result, it will be determined by conditions over which we have little or no control.

Additional limitations on our export trade will, no doubt, arise if we decide to adopt, as a prudent national policy, a course of action under which our ships will be kept out of the zones of danger; under which no loans for belligerent governments will be permitted; and under which, no commodities purchased by the belligerents will be permitted to be exported before title to them shall have been transferred to the foreign buyers. Here the decision is within our power. We can, if we so wish, abstain from these self-imposed restrictions, but if we do so, it must be with a clear realization that we shall thus expose ourselves to the risk of dangerous incidents which will increase the possibility of our being drawn into the European conflict. The executive branch of the government is convinced that such inconveniences or losses as may result from this voluntary curtailment of our freedom of action in trade relations constitute, from the viewpoint of the national interest, a worthwhile sacrifice for the enhanced security of our Nation, and for the greater certainty of our remaining at peace.

On the side of imports which we normally receive from what are now belligerent nations, the war will also impose upon us a certain amount of difficulty, resulting from wartime controls of trade. In this respect, our Government is prepared to do its utmost to remove or reduce unnecessary hardships for our business interests, whether growing out of measures of policing trade or out of undue price exactions.

As regards our trade with other neutral nations outside the Western Hemisphere, our endeavor will be to maintain it as nearly as possible on a normal basis. Here our greatest difficulties will arise out of various measures of control adopted by the belligerents as they affect certain neutral countries of Europe. And here again, it will be our policy to steer a balanced course between the greatest practicable protection of our commercial interests and the avoidance of imprudent risks.

In the Western Hemisphere, we are bound to our sister republics by close ties of inter-American friendship and solidarity. Not only are we all partners in the vital enterprise of keeping our 21 nations secure, but we share equally in a common determination to place our economic interrelations upon the soundest possible basis of mutual benefit.

The other 20 American republics are confronted, in varying degrees, with much the same problems of adjustment to the war in Europe as those with which our country is faced. In order to enable all of us, by concerted and cooperative action, to cushion, as much as possible, the impact of the extraordinary conditions imposed upon us by the European war, our nations took an important step, at the Panama conference, toward creating necessary machinery for this purpose. The Inter-American, Financial and Economic Advisory Committee, which is to begin its functioning in Washington within a few weeks, is designed to furnish a means of discussion and action with respect to problems of trade, finance, and other phases of economic relations and activity which press for solution within and among our nations. The first meeting of representatives of the national treasuries, scheduled to meet in Guatemala next month in pursuance of an important decision adopted by the Lima conference of last year, is another step in the same direction.

Some of the American countries face difficulties arising out of loss of European markets for some of their staple exports. Some are confronted with inability to receive normal imports from accustomed sources of supply. Some are face to face with financial or monetary problems of a pressing emergency character. We shall all benefit in proportion as our nations succeed, by cooperative effort, in easing or solving these problems and difficulties.

So far I have dealt with questions of Government policy and action. That, of course, is only a part of the story. It is true that under conditions of increased Government control of trade and of economic life in general, which are characteristic of wartime periods, the significance of Government action increases in proportion. But even so, in a country such as ours, private enterprise, represented by groups like the one here assembled, continues to be the mainspring of economic activity. In the difficult days which lie ahead, just as in more normal times, your initiative, your energy, your ingenuity, your understanding of the broad problems comprising the national interest, and your willingness to act on that understanding will be among the decisive factors in determining the degree to which we shall be able to maintain our national well-being in a world harassed by war.

So much for our immediate problems. We all know how difficult and how pressing they are. But in our search for their most effective solutions let us not forget for one moment those broader and more far-reaching objectives which we must keep constantly before us if the human race is not again to doom itself, all too soon, to reaping a whirlwind of its own sowing.

Wars come to an end, and with their ending begins the even more difficult work of reconstruction. If the sad story of the last two decades is not to repeat itself at the conclusion of the present war, there must be kept alive somewhere in the world a clear understanding of the failures of the recent past and of the dangers for the future if these failures are reenacted.

I have already indicated that one of the most disastrous shortcomings of the period following the World War was the nature of the commercial policies pursued by the nations of the world. Fortunately, side by side with the forces which were pushing nations in the direction of increasing trade restriction and trade diversion, there were also operative in the world forces which were working in the opposite direction.

During the past 5 years our country has taken a position of leadership in an effort to promote the material well-being of our Nation and of every nation through the establishment and strengthening of sound and healthy international economic relations. By inaugurating and vigorously implementing our reciprocal trade agreements program we have sought to bring about an abandonment throughout the world of trade policies which had resulted in excessive restriction of commerce, in an artificial diversion of trade, and thus in acute economic distress. We have sought to place our commerce with the rest of the world upon a basis of reasonable regulation and nondiscriminatory treatment, in order to give business enterprise the greatest possible scope for profitable operation in foreign trade—to the advantage of business and to the benefit of the Nation as a whole.

Today, as a result of the war in Europe, some of the tendencies in the methods of trade regulation which we and other nations have sought to combat in recent years have become greatly intensified. That is an inescapable consequence of the war situation. But it does not mean that these disruptive tendencies must necessarily become permanently established in international commercial relations after the end of the war.

To believe that this would be likely to happen would be to abandon ourselves to hasty counsels of despair. The experience of the period immediately following the last war and, even more, the experience of recent years have demonstrated the destructive nature of such practices as embargoes, quotas, exchange controls, unreasonably high tariffs, and various other means of regimenting and forcing trade. These practices may have their place in time of war, when the central objective is the creation of the instrumentalities of armed force at no matter what sacrifice of human welfare. There is no place for them in time of peace, when the desired objective is the promotion of the well-being of individuals and of nations, for which a healthy functioning and expansion of international commerce is an indispensable prerequisite.

If, after the termination of this war, commercial policies characteristic of extreme economic nationalism should become dominant, then mankind would enter upon an indefinite period of alternating economic conflicts and armed warfare—until the best attainments of civilization and progress will have been destroyed. I cannot believe that this is the fate in store for the world. I, for one, hold fast to the conviction that, however grave have been the errors of the recent decades, however much suffering and destruction may lie ahead in the immediate future, there is, in all nations, sufficient strength of will and sufficient clarity of vision to enable mankind to profit by the costly lessons of the past and to build upon a sounder foundation than heretofore.

There is much that our country can do toward that end. We must retain unimpaired our firm belief that only through enduring peace, based on international law and morality, and founded upon sound international economic relations, can the human race continue to advance. We must cooperate to the greatest possible extent with our sister republics of the Americas and with all other nations to keep this conviction alive and to maintain the basic principles of international good faith, world order under law, and constructive economic effort.

In the economic field the guiding lines of the policies which we should pursue are clear. Nothing that has happened has weakened in any way the validity of the basic ideals which have underlain our commercial policy in recent years. The type of international economic relations which we have sought to establish through our reciprocal-trade agreements has been amply proven by experience to be the only effective means of enabling the process of international trade to perform fully its function as a powerful instrument for the promotion of economic welfare and for the strengthening of the foundations of enduring peace.

For the immediate future we must continue our efforts to maintain and expand our trade program within such temporary limitations as may be dictated by the exigencies of wartime conditions. We are, in fact, engaged today in important trade-agreement negotiations, notably with the American nations. We shall neglect no opportunity, wherever it may present itself, to expand the area of our negotiations. We must not be diverted from this essential purpose by the acts or utterances of those who, intentionally or unintentionally, seek to mislead the public mind into the belief that our efforts have been rendered powerless by the unhappy circumstances of today.

When the war is over, we must stand ready to redouble our efforts in the direction of economic progress. As the process of post-war reconstruction begins, the task of restoring international trade relations on a sound basis will be even more difficult than it has been heretofore. But it will be even more imperatively necessary if, after the setbacks and prostrations of recent decades, mankind is to resume its upward climb.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter I have received from General Pershing.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, President Roosevelt has proclaimed today as General Casimir Pulaski Day to honor the memory of that great hero and patriot of Poland. I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on that subject.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. THORKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter from Col. E. M. House to Hon. David Lloyd George.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a broadcast made by myself last evening.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on Count Casimir Pulaski, the Polish patriot.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRON asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an open letter written by me to the Gallup poll.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter and list I received from the secretary of the Southern Council on International Relations in regard to neutrality.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BOLLES] for 10 minutes under the special order of the House heretofore made.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BOLLES. Mr. Speaker, I come not to bury Caesar but to praise him.

On Monday, Mr. Speaker, a great Member of this House, great in his influence and admired by every new Member here, particularly on the Republican side, passed from the Chamber with shock and sorrow registered by all those new Members.

White-plumed Henry of Navarre had tripped in his own stirrup and been unhorsed.

When I came here to take a seat in Congress I had an idea that no matter what party had elected a Member, he was equal in every way, so far as rights, privileges, and standing were concerned, with all others. I have never blindly followed partisanship here or elsewhere.

I pay tribute here to the kind consideration given to new Members by the Speaker of this House. I think the old tradition that a new Member should be seen and not heard has been broken down by this attitude of the Speaker, and in the name of these new Members I thank him.

But to return to my mutton. I say here that I was shocked Monday when the gentleman from Virginia, whom we have loved and supported, went out of character. I would like to ask that gentleman a question. Who wrote that speech? Did he write it or was it handed to him from the pen of the smear professor of the dirt-spreaders cult of the Raskob committee? It smelled like that. If that is so, if that speech was a hand-out, used under political pressure, I can forgive it. If it was his own, I can only think of those lines:

To crook the pregnant hinges of the knee that thrift may follow fawning.

Mr. Speaker, I think also of the double character in Ingoldsby Legends where:

The prince-bishop uttered a curse and a prayer,
Which his double capacity hit to a nicety.
His lay-brother half induced him to swear,
While his Episcopal motley said "Benedicite."

Mr. Speaker, I have some things here I would like to have put in the RECORD in their entirety.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BOLLES]?

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is it the gentleman wants to put in the RECORD?

Mr. BOLLES. This entire thing.

Mr. THOMASON. The gentleman wants to put all of that in the RECORD?

Mr. BOLLES. Yes; sure.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I think under the circumstances we will have to object.

Mr. BOLLES. I knew it would storm you down. What are you going to do about it?

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. BOLLES. Mr. Speaker, I have before me, and it ought to go in the RECORD, the documentary evidence of the work of 442 paid servants of the United States Government who are on the pay roll at anywhere from \$3,000 to \$6,000 a year. One of them gets \$7,200 a year. That is all right. They are just newspapermen, friends of mine, and belong to the same Masonic order of newspapermen that I do. They all write this stuff. They want a job. They want the pay check and everything else.

This is yesterday's bunch of junk right here.

Mr. HOFFMAN. About how many pounds?

Mr. BOLLES. I did not weigh this. The only scale I have is the scale of justice, and it does not weigh this kind of junk. Now, then, I have for a number of days collected this outburst of political effluvia, born in the pornographic mind of political prostitutes, which seeks to tell the cock-eyed public of the United States of America.

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLES. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. Are not most of those Hoover hold-overs?

Mr. BOLLES. Oh, no. These are brand new new dealers. I will show you this. There is not one single man here who is a Hoover hold-over.

Mr. HOOK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLES. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOOK. How about Chairman Fahey, of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation?

Mr. BOLLES. He has not a single word in here. They are too busy foreclosing mortgages on home owners' loans.

Mr. HOOK. He happens to be a Hoover hold-over.

Mr. BOLLES. That is all right. He has not anything in here.

Mr. HOOK. Probably the gentleman left out the Hoover hold-overs.

Mr. BOLLES. No. The gentleman is probably wrong, as usual.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLES. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. It may be that Mr. Fahey is a Hoover hold-over, but he must have turned New Deal or else the New Deal control of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation would not have selected him as Chairman.

Mr. BOLLES. He is too busy foreclosing home owners' loan mortgages.

Mr. HOOK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLES. I refuse to yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLES. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The administration must have some competent men to help them, must it not? That is probably why they keep Fahey.

Mr. BOLLES. I should suppose that occasionally they might pick out somebody who had both mental attitude and working capacity as well as ones who may be appointed from purely political considerations.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is to help get the work done. After all, there is some work down there.

Mr. BOLLES. They tell me that in my home district I will have the appointment of census enumerators, because the people I appoint will have a sufficient amount of capacity to make such enumerations. They could not find anybody else in the district who would.

Mr. HOOK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLES. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOOK. I want to recall to the gentleman's attention that it was under Chairman Fahey that the attorney was appointed who sent out those franked letters all over the United States that he did not have any business doing.

Mr. BOLLES. He did not put pressure on the whole of the United States of America to raise millions for a birthday ball, though.

Mr. HOOK. But the money that was raised for the birthday ball went for a good purpose.

Mr. BOLLES. Oh, sit down. I am sorry to libel Michigan.

These publications are paid for by the United States Government. There is absolutely no way by which anybody can get anything out of this National Capital in the mail for any purpose to help him unless he pays for it out of his own pocket outside of the rules and regulations that dominate our privileges here.

It is perfectly proper. The only thing I regret is that I am not on that committee which the gentleman from New York, HAMILTON FISH, heads. They did not think I amounted to enough to invite me to be on it, so I am not on it, but I wish I were.

The whole people of America stand here right now at home desiring only one thing, that the United States of America do not enter a war. Every time I hear about this war proposition I can see marching up and down in the trenches the face of my dead son, who was one of the victims of the last war.

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLES. No. I can see that face. What do you have to say?

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. The gentleman has a lot of sympathy for the men that march in war. Did the gentleman march in the Spanish war, or the last war, or the Civil War?

Mr. BOLLES. No. I would have liked to have been in the Civil War.

Mr. ANDERSON of Missouri. What about the World War?

Mr. BOLLES. I will put my record up against that of the gentleman from Missouri.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BOLLES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLES. Just a minute. I have this boy from Missouri on my neck.

There was a shavetail lieutenant examining me, and he said that I had a bum eye and I could not go to war. Well, I can see farther than the gentleman from Missouri.

I yield now to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. With reference to legislation that will keep us out of war, may I say that the American people are more interested in the fact that we are kept out of war rather than in what legislation we may pass in order to meet that end?

Mr. BOLLES. Yes.

Now, to return to my mutton, I wish to say here definitely that I deprecate the attitude of any Member of this House who would stand here and disparage the character or question the motives of any Member of this House, particularly when he is so vulnerable in the matters of which he was speaking. I do not like it. I hope it will never occur again. I hope this House will remember that. I am going to forget. I love this gentleman from Virginia. I have worked with him and fought with him and helped him in the investigation he is making, but when he comes here and talks about a man raising a few dollars to send out literature concerning peace, whether it be from his own office or from some other office, what does it matter, when the Government of the United States, with an army of 442 servants, paying them about \$240,000, can write and print and send out this kind of stuff, which every newspaper editor of the United States gives a three-way play—desk to open to wastebasket. The wastebaskets of every newspaper office of the United States have had to be enlarged and have additions built on them. I know; I sit there myself and handle this stuff. Nobody prints this; it is junk. But it does get into the hands of a few people who believe it because it is a Government document.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLES. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Are not the taxpayers of the country paying for the various agencies that are set up in every department of the Government for the purpose of sending out this literature?

Mr. BOLLES. Oh, of course; but there is no such animal as the taxpayer any more. He is just the "forgotten man," except on the 15th day of March.

Mr. RICH. Did not the Congress at its last session make appropriations of hundreds of thousands of dollars compelling the taxpayers, whether they wanted to or not, to pay to put out all that junk?

Mr. BOLLES. Yes. Does the gentleman know how much that amounts to? I want to bring out these figures here. It will amount to \$240,000 or more each year.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLES. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. Do I understand that all of this material, piled 2 or 3 feet high on the table beside the gentleman, is material that has been sent to the newspapers as propaganda?

Mr. BOLLES. Here is a bunch right here; here is another bunch right here. This is the bunch that came over yesterday. These are the bunches over a period of a week. I wanted to put them all in the RECORD, I may say to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. That might break the Government, although the people should have the facts. I would have to object to that because the volume is so enormous it would cost too much. But what I want to inquire about is, has the gentleman offered a resolution that the Congress investigate this mass of propaganda that is going out from the departments as Government literature?

Mr. BOLLES. No; I have not, but I thought I would.

Mr. MICHENER. Does not the gentleman think it would be a pretty good thing to do, because if what the gentleman says is true and this vast amount of material is being sent out by these four hundred and how many—

Mr. BOLLES. Four hundred and thirty-two.

Mr. MICHENER. Four hundred and thirty-two propagandists.

Mr. BOLLES. Paid servants.

Mr. MICHENER. No; they are paid propagandists in the several departments. I use these words advisedly because that is their purpose, to propagandize their several departments, to sell this New Deal philosophy to the people. They are paid by the taxpayers. Why does not the gentleman introduce a resolution and let us have an investigation that is worth while? If the Government is employing 432 expert propagandists or ghost writers to load up the newspapers and, in a subtle way, influence the uninformed, the truth should be made available. If these activities are good, we ought to know about them and the country ought to know about them. What protection has the people if no opportunity is given to explain or expose propaganda put out by agencies of the administration?

Mr. BOLLES. I intended to prepare a resolution, I may say to the gentleman, to bring in with this pile of junk, and I shall do so when it is in order.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BOLLES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLLES. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I believe the gentleman will find that when the appropriations bills and the bills authorizing appropriations come before the House there is in them language to the effect that a certain amount of money may be used for this specific purpose.

Mr. BOLLES. Absolutely.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If this is true, I do not see any object in asking for an investigation. We can eliminate items of that kind from the appropriation bills if we are willing to do so, and I am willing to do so.

Mr. BOLLES. Oh, no. A lot of this stuff is buried under a brush heap where the smell of the skunk is not noticeable.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Perhaps I am in error in saying we could eliminate all of it, but we could eliminate a large amount of it.

Mr. BOLLES. Yes; we could, but you do not do it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is correct, we do not do it.

Mr. BOLLES. No. You sit here and vote for it day after day.

Mr. CRAWFORD. No, I do not.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; if it is not taken out of my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, for a few moments permit me to call to the attention of the few who are here in the House today the manner in which our national-defense program is being menaced by the C. I. O. and the Communists.

While the President reports hostile submarines off our shores; while Germany warns us that the *Iroquois* is to be destroyed; while Great Britain denies our right to establish a neutral zone as advocated by the Americas; while Stalin joins hands with Hitler and apparently prepares to turn loose the "red" menace upon all civilization, we here in America sleep on, blind to the very real danger of the "reds," who, day after day, strike at the very foundation of our Government, at our national defense.

We are all familiar with the fact that in most industries—industries which are essential to a successful national defense,

to say nothing of the carrying on of a foreign war into which only the most earnest, patriotic efforts of this Congress can prevent us becoming involved; industries such as coal, steel, motors, and oil, John L. Lewis—his C. I. O. has obtained a strangle hold—is in a position where, if war comes, and under the present plans for a selective draft, men in essential industries such as those enumerated will be left at home while other loyal citizens are sent to foreign lands, this Government can be successfully destroyed.

Right here at home there is plenty of trouble if we want to look for it or if we want to see it when it appears on the front pages of the newspapers.

Here is a situation to which your attention is called and to which we may all give serious thought and then act. The last Congress appropriated millions of dollars for national defense. We authorized the construction not only of additional battle-ships and the purchase of munitions of war of all kinds, but we gave instructions and we appropriated the money for the building of millions of dollars' worth of airplanes. We did this on the theory that these airplanes are necessary immediately to our national defense. We did not authorize those airplanes, we did not appropriate the money to build them to send across the water so they might be used in a war over in the other hemisphere.

The War Department and the Navy Department entered into contracts for the construction of those planes. Among the contracts entered into by the War Department was one with the Bohn Aluminum & Brass Corporation, of Detroit, which has several plants. This contract was for the making of bearings which are to be used in motors.

On the 29th day of August an affiliate of the C. I. O. called a strike at the Bohn plant. This strike was not called for the purpose of getting shorter hours or higher wages. It was called to force every man who worked in the plants of this corporation to pay dues to this particular union.

The bargaining agent for the employees for this company was a C. I. O. affiliate. That organization made a demand upon the company for a closed or preferential shop; that is, that all employees be required to pay dues in order to work. Look at this proposition as it is. Here is a great factory, employing thousands of men, engaging in manufacturing bearings which are absolutely necessary if this Nation is to be prepared to defend itself on land and sea. Here is a union organization which on the 29th day of August 1939 closed that great factory engaged on Government work and demanded that no one work therein until he agreed to pay tribute to it.

Follow them and see where we get if we permit that kind of thing to continue. Under the plan of the President, announced not so very long ago through the public press, when the draft law is put into force one of the last groups to be taken will be those engaged in essential industries, and those essential industries are coal, steel, motors, and oil. So, if the C. I. O. can get control over all the men, as it proposes to do or as it proposed to do in this particular strike, who enter those industries, then they are the last to be called in case of war; and who goes to fight the war? Those who do not belong to these organizations will be called first.

Here is what the C. I. O. did in this particular strike, which began on the 29th of August and continued until day before yesterday—Monday, the 9th day of October. They tied up those factories engaged in the manufacture of bearings which went into motors which the Army and Navy needed for national defense. There is no question about it. Stalin himself could have taken no course to more effectively hamper, to have obtained control over the production of articles which are necessary for American defense, than did this union. Here is a labor organization which demands that in order to aid our country in preparing for its defense all men must acknowledge allegiance to it.

Here you have in America an organization which reaches out its hand and stops the wheels in the factories which are producing those things that are essential to our national defense, and we sit here and do nothing about it, and the administration does nothing about it.

Turn now to the situation as it applied to the Navy. The Navy had a contract for the construction of a bearing which went into a motor which was necessary for the production of a special type of airplane which the Navy deemed essential for our national defense. The bearing could not be obtained from any other company. The Bohn Aluminum & Brass Corporation had on hand a large number of these bearings. It had in its possession the plans and specifications which belonged to the Navy and the possession of which was necessary if the bearings were to be manufactured; and then the C. I. O. affiliate—and there is no doubt but that the C. I. O. is shot through and through with communistic ideas and that it employs communistic methods—threw a picket line around this plant and for 41 calendar days held up the production and delivery of bearings which the United States Army and Navy needed, and by force prevented the delivery to the Navy of parts which are absolutely necessary to make the planes that protect our country. What do you think of that kind of a situation? I go one step further, and I am making these statements on my responsibility as a Member of this House. When the Navy of the United States demanded of this union that it withdraw its pickets, and that these parts be delivered so they could be put into the Navy planes, the union refused. How do you like that? It is not treason, because we are not engaged in war, but it is a criminal conspiracy to overthrow or to prevent the activities of this Government, and to do it by force. In the words of Chief Justice Marshall, it was "a conspiracy to subvert by force the Government of our country." And the man at the head of that strike was Frankenstein. This strike and its results were called to the attention of the Labor Department, and the officials of the company were called down here and they were told by the War Department that the production and delivery of these parts was necessary, and that the strike must be ended. But did the Government call down the representative of the union? If it did the union representative did not come. Oh, no. Frankenstein, sitting in Detroit, called up the Labor Department and told them what the union wanted. And the strike was settled. How do you like that? Who is running this Government, and what is the sense of sitting here and voting millions of dollars to produce planes and to manufacture munitions of war when all the time overhanging us is this red hand controlled by Russia, which says, on occasion, as it did one day not in the distant past, and as it will some day not in the distant future, but as it did from the 29th day of August to the 9th day of October—41 calendar days—"you may not fill that order"; holding in its grasp the manufacture and production and delivery of parts essential to our national defense. What happens to Frankenstein? Is he prosecuted? Oh, no. Frankenstein was the man appointed by Governor Murphy to distribute relief in the State of Michigan, and today Attorney General Murphy does not see Frankenstein, or his hand in this criminal conspiracy. Now, I ask you, Where is our manhood, where is our courage, where is our patriotism, our loyalty to our system of government, when we submit to such a situation as this? How much longer are we going to let John L. Lewis and his C. I. O., the Communists within its ranks, tell us and the President of the United States who can and who cannot work and when and where this Government of ours is to obtain delivery of articles upon which our national defense depends? Take that question home with you and come back tomorrow or later in the week or next week, if you cannot before find the answer, and then declare that no longer will we submit to these Communists who get their orders from Moscow, to the C. I. O. which conceives itself to be above the law, to be more powerful than the Government itself. How long are we going to sit here and stand for this sort of a proposition? I will drop into the basket tomorrow a bill to make it a criminal offense to prevent or interfere with the manufacture of necessary Government implements or munitions of war; and I shall drop into the basket also a resolution, privileged, calling on the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of War to tell us the facts; and you gentlemen then can read the official record

and see how much of my statement is true. Then, if you want, you can sit here day after day and let this red menace that comes from across the sea interfere with our national defense if you desire, but you will never be able to say that you were not advised of the danger. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LYNDON B. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and to include a brief editorial from the Baltimore Sun.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. THORKELOSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 30 minutes at the conclusion of the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Montana asks unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] he may address the House for 30 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

NUMBER OF STRIKES SINCE 1928

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, we have just heard the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] tell us what has happened in the way of strikes in this country, and especially at a time when it is very imperative if this country wants to be put on a proper defense basis, in order that it may protect its shores and its people in case of any eventuality. I do not believe that the Congress or the American people want this country to be put in a position where it cannot have adequate defense. On the other hand, I do not believe that citizens of the country want to have any larger Army nor any larger Navy nor any larger air force than is necessary for that particular purpose—adequate national defense. So that when we are trying to get our country on a footing where we may have adequate defense it seems that it is the wrong thing for anyone in the country, if they are good, sound, honest American citizens, to strike in order that we may not accomplish that end. I think it perfectly right for labor organizations to use the strike method to secure justice for the worker insofar as they do not interfere with the normal operation of our Government; but I call attention at this time to the great number of strikes that have occurred in this country since 1928, and I think this information is of sufficient value to make Members realize what is going on because of the war that we are now having between the A. F. of L. and the C. I. O. Certainly one of those organizations must be wrong. There is something that is wrong that will permit labor that is striking for the benefit of the individual workman to do things that are not only contrary to the welfare of the workers of the country but are contrary to the principles involved in trying to take care of our Nation and our national defense.

In 1928 we had 604 strikes. In 1929, 921 strikes. In 1930, 637 strikes. In 1931, 810 strikes. In 1932, 841 strikes. There is an average of about 760 strikes per year during the years 1929 to 1932.

But let us see what happened beginning in 1933. Since the New Deal has operated our Government, in 1933 we had 1,695 strikes—more than double what we had on the average in the 5 preceding years. In 1934 we had 1,856 strikes in this country. In 1935 we had 2,014. Just note how they are increasing yearly from 1933. In 1936 we had 2,172 strikes in this country. In 1937 it jumped to 4,740 strikes. Think of it—6 times as many as we had in the previous 5 years before

this administration came into power. Are strikes a symbol of success? If so, then this administration is successful in that respect.

In 1938 we had 2,772 strikes. From 1928 to 1932 there was a total of 3,812 strikes in this country. From 1933 to 1939 we had 15,247 strikes in this country—over 450 percent increase in the number of strikes over the last 5 years preceding this administration's coming into power.

Does it not seem as if there was something wrong? Is it possible that labor is being benefited by this great number of strikes, when there are the number of workers involved in these various lay-offs? Labor loses, manufacturers lose, capital loses, and the country loses.

I want to insert in the RECORD the number of man-days that were lost during those strikes and the workers involved. It certainly will convince the Members of Congress, and certainly ought to convince labor, that the method the labor unions are pursuing at the present time must be wrong.

Strikes in United States, 1928-38

Year	Number of strikes	Number of workers involved	Number of man-days idle
1928	604	314,210	12,631,863
1929	921	285,572	5,351,540
1930	637	182,975	3,316,808
1931	810	341,817	6,893,244
1932	841	324,210	10,502,033
1933	1,695	1,168,272	16,872,128
1934	1,856	1,466,695	19,872,128
1935	2,014	1,117,213	15,456,337
1936	2,172	788,648	13,901,956
1937	4,740	1,890,621	28,424,857
1938	2,772	688,376	9,148,273

Bureau of Labor Statistics, Apr. 10, 1939.

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield.

Mr. GEYER of California. Would not the gentleman like to discuss for a few moments the decrease in the number of strikes after the time when the Supreme Court passed upon a certain bill? Do you not think it would give a different bearing if the gentleman would give us those figures?

Mr. RICH. If I had those figures I assure you I would be glad to give them to you. I, however, do not have them. But I want to say to the gentleman that there is something wrong in Denmark. There is something wrong in America when there are the number of strikes which we have now. If you pick up the morning Post or the morning Times-Herald, you will see listed a number of strikes in the city of Washington. Look at the New York Times of this morning and see the number of strikes going on there. Pick up any paper you want to in this Nation and see what is happening. Strikes, strikes, strikes all over. You will see that notwithstanding a decision of the Supreme Court, this country is being overburdened with strikes. This country is being over-influenced by radicals—men who come here from Russia; men who have come here from foreign countries, who have "isms" in their souls. It is time we took the "isms" out of all those fellows except Americanism, or else let us send them back over the ocean where they belong. [Applause.]

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In the study which the gentleman has given to this presentation he is now making, what, in his opinion, is the primary cause of that tremendous increase in the number of strikes in the latter period as compared with the prior period?

Mr. RICH. My own personal opinion is the fact that we have so many radicals in this country who do not care a rap for the men they are trying to work for in the labor unions. They do not care a tinker's hoot for the manufacturers of this country. They do not care a rap for this country of ours. All they want to do is pull down ten, fifteen, or twenty-five thousand dollars a year salaries, and they want to do everything that the Russian Government would like to have them do. They are the fellows who are responsible, in my judgment, for these strikes. The sooner

the Dies Committee lines them up and we load them on a boat and send them overseas, the better we will be off. I hope I have the privilege of going down there to help load them on.

That is one reason I would like to see American boats used now for transporting radical aliens, because I would not want to contaminate any foreign vessels taking them across the ocean. But I think we have enough red-blooded Americans in this country who will load them on and man the ships and take them over the ocean to some place and dump them on some island perhaps. I think perhaps the best place would be to take them down to the South Sea Islands where there are no inhabitants and leave them there. We might send them a little food to keep them from starving to death, but there they could have any kind of government they wanted. They could do anything they chose, so long as they did not kill each other. If they happened to want to take that method of eradicating themselves, that would be all right with me. [Laughter.]

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield for one further question?

Mr. RICH. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman is an experienced manufacturer. I have made a pretty close study of the wage structure in my own district. Is it not true in the gentleman's district—and I will say it is true in my district—that during this latter period which has been described wages have materially increased?

Mr. RICH. That is a fact.

Mr. CRAWFORD. And the wage increases have occurred without being forced into operation by any law which the Congress has passed. In the gentleman's opinion, have the strikes been the result of the workers being dissatisfied, primarily, with the wages they received, or are they primarily the result of these agitators, non-Americans, to whom the gentleman has referred?

Mr. RICH. It is primarily the result of those agitators. American labor today is desirous and anxious to work. The American manufacturer today is doing everything he can to try to help his employees. The American manufacturer realizes that the most valuable asset he has in his business is the work that is produced by American workmen. It is more vital to the businessman than buildings and machinery. It is more vital to business than capital. Capital and labor are indispensable to business.

It would be impossible to get along without them. This is the first consideration. Manufacturers want happy, contented employees, for a manufacturer knows when they are in that frame of mind he is able to produce products such as he could not otherwise produce.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a few brief questions?

Mr. RICH. Certainly. I yield to my friend from Wisconsin.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Is not this alien-directed wave of strike terrorism unfair to more than 12,000,000 of our people who are unemployed, who want jobs and cannot find them?

Mr. RICH. Absolutely. If the gentleman would investigate the real causes of the strikes, he would agree with me that it is imperative that we change some of the laws that have been put on the statute books—the Wagner Act and the set-up of the N. L. R. B. The fact is that American laborers are compelled by these radical labor leaders to quit their jobs when they do not want to.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROBERTSON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Is it not a fact that most of these strikes the gentleman mentions, strikes that have been destroying jobs, were instigated by professional agitators and

racketeers, perhaps many of whom never had on a pair of overalls in their lives, and who take a position that a working man or woman shall not earn their bread in the sweat of their brow unless their labor is sold by said professionals?

Mr. RICH. The great majority of these strikes have been brought about by radical communistic labor agitators.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. And when the gentleman makes arrangements to load these alien professional racketeer labor-union agitators on that boat I hope he will reserve first-class passage on the first boat for that alien Communist British subject, Harry Bridges, who has been trying to destroy our American merchant marine, which is an essential arm of our national defense. Bridges is a subject of Great Britain who came to America from Australia. Since the country of his allegiance is now engaged in war, Bridges, an experienced guerrilla warfare leader, would render exceptional service to his King.

Mr. RICH. I may say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that this boat should be big enough to put all men on who do not believe in the American form of government, the American Constitution, and the American way of living. I think it ought to be big enough to put them all on, because we have no place in America for anybody who does not believe in these principles. Put all on that boat who cannot look up to the American flag and say: "That is my flag; that is the flag that flies over my country; I want to protect that flag." If he will not get on the boat voluntarily, I want to see the proper authorities take hold of him and put him on. And you and I will be glad to help them—with force, power, bayonets, guns, or fists, if necessary.

Mr. HAWKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield.

Mr. HAWKS. Is it not a fact that the principle of collective bargaining is absolutely all right, but that the difficulty and danger comes from the leadership of the unions under collective bargaining? Is not that destroying the whole labor program in this country?

Mr. RICH. The gentleman is absolutely right. The principle of collective bargaining is the proper mode of procedure in labor-employer relations. Labor should be allowed to get together to try to settle their differences with their employers. They should be allowed to sit down and talk to their employers, but under the National Labor Relations Act if an employee goes to his employer and tries to talk to him in reference to his employment and his difficulties, right away the National Labor Relations Board steps up and says to the employer: "Because you have talked to that individual, this case will be thrown out." That is un-American in principle.

If ever we needed a law changed, it is the National Labor Relations Act and the Wagner Act. President Roosevelt said the Neutrality Act was wrong but that he signed it. He wants it changed. Let the President remember also that he signed the order setting up the National Labor Relations Board and the Wagner Act, and they are just as bad as the Neutrality Act. Why does he not recommend a change? I shall be pleased to help him and support him in trying to change all of them.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. PITTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time may be extended 1 minute. I wish to ask him a question.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as we have plenty of time I ask unanimous consent that my time may be extended for a minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTINGER. My question may not be exactly in point, but I should like to ask the gentleman if he does not believe that while the House is marking time and the Senate debating a bill it would be well for Congress to take up uncompleted legislation? By this I mean legislative matters that were not reached in the first session of the Seventy-sixth Congress. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that there are a number of important bills that were not reached in the last session of Congress prior to its adjournment on

August 5; for instance, the amendment to the W. P. A. Relief Act of 1940 and a lot of other bills.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman is absolutely right. We have been here now for 3 weeks but we have not done a thing.

The House of Representatives has passed only one bill, giving us our mileage, paying the Members of Congress for coming here, sitting around, and doing nothing. We could be changing some of these laws that have been enacted during the last 5 or 6 years that are wrong, laws that are doing more damage and more to hinder the orderly pursuit of government than anything else possibly could. I think the gentleman is right. We should be here considering this legislation and changing these laws so that we can make this country what we would all like to have it—a better America; a better place to live; a happy and contented people. I hope we will preserve our form of government, our Constitution, and our flag.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VREELAND. I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include two radio speeches on the dedication of Seton Hall College.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. VREELAND]? There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana [Mr. THORKELOSON] for 30 minutes.

Mr. THORKELOSON. Mr. Speaker, in my discourse of yesterday I deviated from my subject a little. I referred to Great Britain and the propaganda that has been carried on by that Government for a number of years, and the propaganda that is now going on in the daily papers, as well as in many magazines. I have a magazine here in which there is an article entitled "Military Alliance with England," by Lord Beaverbrook.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include this article in connection with my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. THORKELOSON]? There was no objection.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, how long is the article?

Mr. THORKELOSON. Eight columns in this magazine.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is that the Lord Beaverbrook, the British publisher, who had dinner at the White House the other day?

Mr. THORKELOSON. I believe it is.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. THORKELOSON]? There was no objection.

The article referred to follows:

[From the American Mercury of August 1939]

A MILITARY ALLIANCE WITH ENGLAND

(By Lord Beaverbrook)

The United States and Great Britain will, I believe, enter into a military and naval alliance in the course of time. They will make such an alliance because they must do so. There is no alternative for these two nations but to find security for the future in the companionship of one another.

In some quarters in Britain it is believed that the United States will not have the alliance. And there is, accordingly, a reluctant tendency to put this ideal of closer relations in the category of admirable but unattainable objects. This regretful conviction is, in my view, profoundly mistaken. Perhaps the people of the United States take the view that Britain's liabilities are too big and her assets not big enough. If this were an accurate estimate of the situation of Britain, then, of course, it would be a reasonable attitude to adopt. No one could quarrel with it. The matter would be at an end. But it is not accurate. Indeed, it is totally wrong. Britain would bring very substantial assets to any joint account that the two nations might enter on. And, if we are to have a true picture of the situation between the two countries, we must not leave the liabilities of the United States out of the reckoning. Make no mistake; those liabilities are great indeed, and you do not escape from them by withdrawing from the Philippines. On balance, I believe the surplus of assets is to be found on the side of the British Empire.

There is, to begin with, the very great burden you have incurred under the Monroe Doctrine, to defend all the independent states of the American Continent against the aggression of a foreign power. This is a heavy responsibility. It may seem that an at-

tack on any South American country by a foreign state is a very remote contingency. But are you so sure that it is? For instance, we have seen Italians in the Argentine determining the policy of that republic to the League of Nations. Will the Italians go further? We live in an age of hungry and ambitious powers whose governments are not subject to the same democratic checks upon reckless adventure as exist in the United States and in Britain.

But another liability is, of course, much more immediate and obvious, the peril in the Pacific. The threat of the Japanese Fleet, with, behind it, the threat of the Japanese Army. There is no need to indulge in scaremongering on this subject. It would be as foolish as it would be wicked. But the simple fact is that in the Japanese Empire we have a proud and ambitious race, fanatically devoted to a national ideal, courageous in battle, and highly equipped for war. This oriental race of splendid qualities has shown itself in recent years swift and ruthless in action, patient and resolute in carrying out a program of expansion. For the moment, its activities are directed to the continent of Asia. But there are necessities which cannot be fulfilled in China. The Japanese seek an outlet for their population. They cannot find it in China, already overcrowded, or in Manchuria, where the climate is unsuitable to their people. Where will they find it? They must look out, across the Pacific Ocean. And what do they see as they look toward the rising sun, the symbol of their national flag? The beautiful seaboard of California.

It may be said that the Japanese will look rather to Australia. But an invasion of Australia would be a military enterprise fraught with immense perils. The tropical archipelago which separates Japan from Australia would be infested with mines, with submarines, and with other destructive craft. Japanese communications would be intolerably harassed. And besides, the British naval base at Singapore, with the Indian Ocean behind it, would provide Britain with the necessary authority, so long as we did not abandon our naval domination.

An attack by the Japanese on the Pacific coast of the United States would certainly have to deal with a serious obstacle in Hawaii, although an attack on Pearl Harbor would not compare in danger with an assault on Singapore. And whereas a landing on the north coast of Australia would be a landing on an undeveloped tropical territory with a small population and separated by deserts from the centers of Australian life, a landing in California would not present such problems. California, moreover, has something which the Japanese want very badly and which they would not find in Australia—oil.

So far as the Pacific is concerned, then, it seems that the United States carries heavier liabilities than the British Empire. But there are other things to be borne in mind. Britain has assets of a positive character. She has the biggest merchant fleet in the world, valuable in itself and with an additional potential value as a source of splendid seamen in time of war. Her navy—on paper equal to the Navy of the United States—is in all probability more powerful in fact. Her air force is reported to be of the highest efficiency and is expanding swiftly at the present time—some say at the rate of more than a squadron a week. There are in the British Empire immense resources of raw materials and of industrial power, sufficient to equip for a war of modern character her millions of white people who, though peaceful, are not without courage.

If there were closer relations between the two nations, if there were an understanding, Britain would not come empty-handed into the association. Indeed, it is obvious that she could contribute something of the highest value to the security of the United States, an undertaking to protect the Atlantic seaboard of your country with her fleet. If America could concentrate her whole Navy in the Pacific with the knowledge that her front door was barred and bolted by battleships flying the British flag, that would be a matter of great comfort to the American people in a moment of stress. And Britain has the resources, the ships, and the naval stations to confer this benefit.

II

It is quite true that there are liabilities as well as assets on the British balance sheet. One of these is of a serious character. As an island lying off the coast of the European Continent, Britain has for centuries taken an interest in the affairs of the European peoples. We have fought in their wars, believing that our own safety was involved in the fortunes of one side or another in the conflict. It has for long been a basic doctrine of British policy that the mouth of the River Scheldt must not be in the hands of a great power. And so slow are statesmen in awakening to changed circumstances that some of them still fail to realize that the policy which was suitable for an island kingdom is quite out of place for an empire which spans the globe and contains vast dominions populated by vigorous and growing peoples.

Americans may argue that closer relations with Britain involve the danger of entanglement in European wars. It is well understood that this would be too high a price to pay for the British association. For this reason those who desire most earnestly to advance toward an understanding with America are most determined and persistent in urging a policy of isolation upon Britain, a policy of detachment from European quarrels.

It is remarkable how slow a nation is to learn by bitter experience, how readily it forgets painful lessons. The Crimean War, so painful in its memories for the British people, sprang out of a situation similar to that with which we recently have had to deal in the war between Italy and Ethiopia. In that case the British Government egged on the Turks to defy the power of Russia. Left to their own devices, the Turks would have submitted to the Russians in the trifling dispute which arose over the possession of the holy places

in Palestine. But with the might of Britain behind them, they chose to resist. In the end there came war, not only upon Turkey but upon Britain also—a long, weary, bloody war on which the nation looked with gloomy horror.

Yet there is no doubt about it; the Crimean War was, in the beginning, a popular war. The people favored it. A section of the newspapers demanded it. The mood of the people was expressed at a dinner held in the Reform Club when Admiral Sir Charles Napier, commander of a British fleet about to leave for the Baltic, said in public that he expected he would be able to declare war against Russia when he reached there. The audience greeted this with cheers and shouts of "Good old Charlie!" And when John Bright opposed the war he was looked upon as a base man guilty of unpatriotic actions.

We have not got so far as that on this occasion. But we have had an English archbishop telling us that it may be necessary to have another great and horrible war to establish the efficacy of the League of Nations. "This generation or the next will probably have to be sacrificed," said the distinguished ecclesiastic.

But there is good reason to suppose that this is a passing mood of the people, not a fixed attitude. It has sprung up swiftly during days of excitement, and generous, although misguided, emotion. The cause of "Little Abyssinia" appealed very much as the cause of the Cuban rebels did to the people of the United States 40 years ago. And these storms of passion rarely, if ever, have an influence in shaping permanent policy. The mood changes too swiftly. Certainly the change in viewpoint is very marked compared with the situation we had in 1922. At that time I was able to take part in a movement which brought down the Prime Minister, Mr. Lloyd George, and destroyed his government. And what was the charge against him? What was the crime he had committed in the eyes of the public? Simply that he had threatened to use military sanctions against the Turks for an offense against a peace treaty, and therefore against the League, every bit as glaring as the Italian invasion of Ethiopia.

The growing strength of the isolation sentiment in the country will be sufficient to defeat any attempt to saddle Britain with a fixed commitment to take part in war on the continent of Europe. And, if there is any movement in the direction of the United States—a movement for which the American people can give the signal—it would inevitably be accompanied by a decision to turn away from Europe.

III

I have tried to establish my belief that in such close relations of the two peoples the balance of advantage would not be all on the one side. It would be an equal association of risks and benefits. By uniting our resources we both gain a measure of security such as we can hardly hope to attain by any other means. Indeed, if we cannot work together, if we must conduct separately our preparations for defense in this troubled world, then, of course, there will be an expenditure on arms, a concentration on military affairs, which our peoples would find irksome and maybe intolerable. We are peaceable-minded folk; we wish to be left to mind our own business and contribute to the welfare of ourselves and our fellows. We hate war. We detest the compulsion and regimentation which is a characteristic of militarist societies. These things are alien to both of us.

Yet we face this situation. The dictator-ruled states are powerful and warlike, openly ambitious and predatory; they use a monopoly of information and the press in order to shape the minds of their populations and prepare the war spirit. And therefore the democracies, standing alone, may have to choose between imitating the methods and emulating the armaments of the dictatorships or, on the other hand, going down to defeat.

Is there any way out of this dilemma which faces us? Indeed there is. The way out of the dilemma is an association of the two great democracies, children respectively of the Puritan revolution and the American Revolution, which would offer us the prospect of security without the loss of the civilian freedom which we cherish, and which would enable us to look on the threatening ambitions of other nations without weighting ourselves down with a load of armaments.

And certainly this conception of closer relations does not rest on self-interest alone. It is based on the belief that there are bonds between the two peoples closer and stronger than those between any two free nations on earth. It is the presence of these bonds which argue most persuasively for the association and which would be the surest guarantee of its success. We spring from the same racial stock. We speak the same language. We cherish the same religious ideas. If there are differences between the creeds and rites found in one country, these differences are repeated in the other. And, having inherited a common stock of traditions, we pursue the same ideals in politics, morals, and social life. Our life, as peoples, consists in the protection, the strengthening, and the spreading of those ideals. And the fact that we hold them in common offers us a reasonable confidence that a real basis of cooperation exists between us. Already it can be said the relations between us are not conceived on the usual pattern of mutual distrust and envy which exists between two foreign nations. We are agreed at least in declaring that war between us is impossible. And this is not a mere commonplace. There are 3,000 miles of undefended common frontier to give it reality.

I do not deny that there have been in the past misunderstandings between our two peoples, sometimes of a serious character; but on no occasion for many generations have these misunderstandings given rise, in the most pressing circumstances, to the

fear of war between our nations. It is true that President Cleveland, in 1896, made use of the old, time-honored expedient of twisting the lion's tail over a boundary dispute in Venezuela. But what was the result? His political opponents at once charged him with attempting to make political capital at the expense of the national interests. Most of his supporters refused to follow him in such expedients. The New York and other newspapers condemned him out of hand. Ministers of the gospel over the length and breadth of the land advised the President to pursue the paths of peace. But if fight he must, the preachers took the view, that the cause of Armenia might be of more interest to the American people than boundary disputes in Venezuela. And, while jingoes sang the words of the national anthem, a cartoon which had given the public in an earlier campaign a representation of Mr. Cleveland joining in the demonstration with a variation of the sentiment by singing "My Country, 'Tis of Me!" was widely reproduced.

Only a few years had passed when Admiral Dewey, moving to the attack on Manila and pursued by German naval forces, was protected by British warships under the command of Captain Chichester. These British ships, ready for action, deliberately sailed into the path of the oncoming Germans, thus forming a rear guard for the advancing American squadron.

Those pages in history are, I regret to say, not well known nor widely read on either side of the Atlantic. Nor is it realized in Britain or the United States that at the time of the War of Independence, the American cause was more popular in the city of London than in the city of New York, and that the American insurgents got support of more value in the House of Commons at Westminster than in the Congress sitting in Philadelphia.

IV

That is the story of the past. What of the days to come?

The issues are graver now than they used to be. War brings with it not the danger of defeat, indemnity, loss of territory, but the possibility of complete devastation, destruction—it may be, the wiping out of whole populations. That is what we have to face. If science has made war so much more deadly and damaging, we should adjust our policies to the new situation. We should, if possible, double our insurance. And what better guaranty of the safety of ourselves and our children could we have than a broad understanding between our two nations, a resolve to walk in companionship?

In that association we should be unassailable, for no possible coalition of hostile nations could equal our strength. We should be free from external quarrels, since we do not harbor aggressive designs in any quarter of the globe. We should follow the rightful purposes of our peoples, free from the obsession of war and able to devote ourselves to beneficial projects. We should be an example to the whole world of the advantages of a determined policy of peace. And in this we should realize, as we can do in no other way, the highest ideals of those Christian peoples, the United States and the British Empire.

These are some of the benefits which will flow from closer relations between the two Nations, sundered for more than a hundred years, and now, I believe, destined to be reunited in a community of interest and of purpose.

MR. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, the reason I propose this request is because the claims in this article are falsehoods. What is set forth in the article did not in reality happen.

I wish to take you back 41 years, when the American Fleet was anchored in Hong Kong Bay, just before declaration of the Spanish-American War. Just before that there were certain of our ships in the harbor of Hong Kong, which I shall name.

Let the record show that for several weeks prior to the breaking out of the Spanish-American War in 1898 the Asiatic squadron of the United States Navy, consisting of the cruisers *Olympia*, *Raleigh*, *Boston*, *Charleston*, and *Baltimore*, and the gunboats *Concord*, *Monocacy*, and *Petrel*, the supply vessel *Zafiro*, the colliers *Brutus*, *Nashan*, and *Nero*, the monitors *Monadnock* and *Monterey*, the transports *City of Pekin* and *Sidney*, and the revenue cutter *McCulloch*, had been lying in the harbor of Hong Kong, China, then under the colonial control of the British. Commodore George Dewey was in command of this squadron. Almost immediately after the declaration of war by the Congress a colonial proclamation of neutrality was issued and Dewey was given 24 hours' notice to put to sea by the British. Dewey repaired with his fleet to Mirs Bay, near Hong Kong, took on coal and supplies from his tenders, and proceeded to Manila. What he accomplished there is a matter of history. This fairy tale of the British admiral sailing in to protect Dewey against attack by the German naval vessels at Manila is just another example of the intensive British propaganda now being used in this country to get us into a military alliance with Great Britain and into the next World War when it really gets under way.

I recall that because I marched with the boys to the Army when we volunteered for that war. The German Fleet was in Manila Bay when Dewey arrived. The English squadron did not intercept the German squadron. When Lord Beaverbrook makes that statement he lies, and I do not like to use that word. I do not care whether he is British or not; that is immaterial; it is the statements that he makes to which I object. Great Britain "funks" on most her promises, yet today this country is filled and overloaded with British propaganda. The headquarters for this propaganda is in London. It is propaganda of the "invisible government." Some day I may have to name those boys so that you will know them, but I am not going to do it now. At any rate, let me say that it is very foolish for the American people to pay any attention to the propaganda that constantly appears in the press, because it has no other purpose in view except to raise our feeling against Central European Powers. The power behind this propaganda machine—the "invisible government"—is particularly desirous of our forming an alliance with England.

In London there is an organization called the British Israel Organization, founded upon the legend of the 10 lost tribes of Israel. There is a paper published by the Anglo-Saxon Federation of America, called *Destiny*, which is purely a propaganda publication, under the auspices of those who propose a world government. Its purpose is to fool the American people. So do not believe all that you read in this magazine.

Several days ago I addressed a letter to the State Department, asking questions with regard to the rights of neutrals and the rights of nations at war. I shall now read these questions into the RECORD. The letter is as follows:

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In line with my telephone conversation today and the kind invitation of Mr. Savage to propose in writing such questions as were not clear to me, I am acting upon that suggestion and request the State Department's reply to the following questions:

1. When Germany, England, and France, or other nations have declared war, does not such declaration include all colonies, territories, or landed surface flying the flag of such nations at war?

The following answers are all my own:

The answer is, "Yes."

2. Who determines the right of blockade?

Nations at war.

3. Who determines the extent of the blockade?

Nations at war.

4. Is it within the right of nations at war to lay down a blockade on the colonies and territories of its enemy?

The answer is, "Yes."

5. Who names the contraband, nations at war, or neutrals?

The answer is, "Nations at war."

6. Is a neutral ship carrying contraband cargo to nations at war or to their colonies considered as a blockade runner?

Yes.

7. Are neutral ships with contraband cargo to nations at war subject to seizure?

Yes.

8a. Isn't a neutral ship with contraband cargo to nations at war subject to seizure after leaving the 3-mile limit of the neutral port until she reaches her destination?

The answer is again "Yes."

b. Are not all neutral ships, with or without cargo (except Red Cross), when bound to nations at war, subject to seizure by the enemy?

The answer is, "Yes."

9. Isn't a neutral ship with a contraband cargo continually in a zone of attack throughout the whole route and subject to interception until she reaches her destination, providing such ports are located in nations and territories engaged in war?

The answer to that question is, "Yes."

10. Assuming that four ships leave the port of New York, each of them with a contraband cargo, one bound to England, one bound to Germany, one bound to an English possession in the Pacific, and one bound to a German possession in the Pacific; assuming further that each of these ships is overhauled by an enemy patrol, isn't it true that each of them will be considered a prize of war, and disposed of accordingly?

The answer is, "Yes."

11. Isn't it true that war zones and patrolled zones are equally dangerous to neutral shipping carrying contraband cargo to the power at war? And that the danger to property and life is exactly the same when intercepted by enemy patrol?

The answer is, "Yes."

12. Isn't it true that the rights of all neutrals outside their own ocean limits, whether it be 3 or 12 miles, are exactly the same, and that one power has no greater right than another neutral power to establish potential safety zones for their own ships by declaring war zones?

The answer to that question is, "Yes."

The next question in this letter is this:

13. When a neutral nation has proclaimed a war zone, to what extent may such nation employ its own navy for the protection of such shipping to territories or possessions of nations at war?

None; it cannot use its own navy to protect such a zone without getting into trouble.

14. If neutral ships are cleared with contraband cargo to the possessions and territories of nations at war, and are captured by an enemy patrol, is such act *causus belli* for the neutral nation that owns the ship?

No, indeed, it is not, because a neutral nation which undertakes to clear its ships with a contraband cargo to nations at war, it follows when such ship is overtaken by an enemy patrol it may be commandeered and the ship seized or else it may be sunk if it cannot be convoyed to port.

15. (a) Isn't it short of an act of war for a neutral to proclaim war zones, and, by indirection, suggest neutral zones and clear its own shipping with contraband cargo to enemy possessions located in assumed safety zones?

It is practically an act of war if you attempt to enforce such a provision.

(b) If a neutral, having declared such war zones, and, by indirection, neutral zones, decides to back up such declaration, isn't the ultimate result going to be war with such powers as refuse to be regimented and ordered about by a neutral nation?

The answer is "Yes."

I propounded these questions because they are intimately concerned with the act we are now considering.

We have no right, of course, to pass any legislation in this House that operates beyond the 3-mile limit of the United States, and that principle holds good for all the other nations in the world, because the 3-mile limit is conceded and accepted among nations throughout the world. There has been some discussion of a 12-mile limit, and there was a discussion of a hundred-mile limit during prohibition time, but that is no longer important.

Here is another thing we must bear in mind: Much has been said in the past 2 days about submarines being off our coast somewhere. Any submarine has a perfect right to be outside of the 3-mile limit. You cannot stop them. They may even come into a harbor, but they must leave the harbor within 24 hours or be interned for the remainder of the war.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THORKELSON. I shall be very pleased to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Under the plan which Under Secretary Welles proposed to the South American dictatorship countries, a 300-mile neutral zone is to be established off the coast of the Americas, and our American Navy is to patrol said zone. Would not the establishment of such a 300-mile zone prohibit cash-and-carry or credit-and-carry shipments of all kinds because the belligerent nations have armed the ships of their merchant marines, and if they come within the 300-mile Welles neutral zone they are subject to extermination by our American Navy, if the 300-mile zone of neutrality means what Welles has said it means?

Mr. THORKELSON. Well, I may tell the gentleman from Wisconsin that the question is rather complicated—

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. I will make it somewhat simpler—

Mr. THORKELSON. Let me answer the question first, please, because I would rather do that.

The British have a perfect right to arm their merchantmen, and a neutral has no right to say whether or not she should arm them. The British nation may arm its own merchant ships, but when they do arm such a vessel it becomes a war vessel. So when a British merchant ship that is armed comes into an American port, it can only remain in that port for 24 hours, or else it will be treated exactly the same as any other war vessel.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. That is the point; and if America adopts the Welles program of a 300-mile neutral zone, then no ship of any belligerent or peaceful nation could come within that zone and carry arms, munitions, implements of war, or war supplies.

Mr. THORKELSON. I am just wondering how it would work out. Of course, Great Britain has expressed an opinion on that, and she has said that if the United States Navy attempted to enforce any provision of that sort, or any such declaration, it would mean war for the United States and nothing else.

I now want to call your attention to another point in this connection. Suppose they set aside a 300-mile zone for merchant ships. These ships make about 8 knots an hour, and it would take them quite a long while to travel through that zone. It would be tantamount to operating within the 3-mile limit. It would take them several days to reach port in a 300-mile zone. Assuming that the 300-mile zone is equal to the 3-mile zone and the distance traveled is under 300 miles in 24 hours, such ship would be theoretically interned before it reached port. The conferences which draft such legislation take too much for granted. Our Federal Government should learn to run the United States first before trying to dictate to the world, and then we will get along much better.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THORKELSON. I will be pleased to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I wish to ask three or four questions in sequence. First, does the gentleman understand that the 21-nation agreement which was agreed upon at Panama is now in operation?

Mr. THORKELSON. I did not know that it is in operation, but if it is, it is very unfortunate for us, because if this agreement is now in operation, it will not be recognized by other nations; and we are in quite a dilemma if we attempt to enforce it. What does it mean? There is not one South American Republic that has a navy worth anything, and it means that the United States would have to protect all of South America and all of the Central American Republics because they do not have an adequate navy for such enforcement or protection.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THORKELSON. Yes.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Let me add this to the gentleman's statement. Is it not true that in these zones 16 of the possessions are British?

Mr. THORKELSON. I could not say as to that, I could not give the exact number. Of course there is quite a number in the Caribbean Sea, and British Honduras, and a lot of other British possessions.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. There are 16 different British possessions and I can give the gentleman the names if he desires.

Mr. THORKELSON. I shall ask the gentleman to place them in the RECORD.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. And does the gentleman not know that there are grave potentialities in this guardianship over these 16 British possessions?

Mr. THORKELSON. In reply to the gentleman I say that there is grave potentiality in such guardianship. If we attempt to enforce it, it will mean war for the United States. It is also going to mean war if we pass this neutrality law which gives the President power he should not have. He cannot enforce it, nor can the Navy. It is all right to agree on an

embargo. That is legal. Nothing can prevent us from doing that, but we cannot without inviting danger enact any legislation that will compel other powers to accept our opinion, because we have no jurisdiction beyond the 3-mile limit. If we attempt to enforce such legislation it means war for the United States and that is all there is to it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THORKEKELSON. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think the gentleman misunderstood me a while ago. I did not mean to say that this agreement is in effect. What I ask is this: Has the gentleman's research work in connection with this subject brought him to the conclusion that this agreement in respect to the 300-mile zone proposition is now in operation? I am seeking information. Does the gentleman understand that it is now in operation?

Mr. THORKEKELSON. All I know is what I see in the newspapers, that a tentative agreement had been reached by those nations represented at the Panama conference. It was a proposition to set aside a 300-mile zone up and down the east and west coasts of North and South America, to be termed a "safety band."

Mr. CRAWFORD. And if, according to your understanding, it is not now in operation, what step must be taken, in the gentleman's opinion, to make the agreement effective insofar as the United States is concerned?

Mr. THORKEKELSON. The agreement naturally will have to come up before the Senate and before the Congress. It cannot be negotiated by the President of the United States without any consultation with Congress.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If the agreement is confirmed by the Senate or otherwise and put into operation, will that, in the gentleman's opinion, constitute a precedent in international law?

Mr. THORKEKELSON. Yes; it will; because it will be a declaration of war if the Senate should agree to that.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If this agreement is consummated and put into operation, will that, in the gentleman's opinion, be an arbitrary extension of international law?

Mr. THORKEKELSON. It will be; certainly; but it will not be agreed to by other nations.

Mr. CRAWFORD. And if these things occur, in the gentleman's opinion, would that type of procedure conflict with the debates which are now being carried on in the Senate, by those who propose to repeal the embargo provisions, to the extent that it conflicts with international law?

Mr. THORKEKELSON. It does not conform to international law at all. It is an arbitrary attitude on the part of the administration to attempt to enact such legislation and suicidal to attempt to enforce. The Senate is now debating upon the repeal of the embargo clause. Why? Because the embargo clause ties the hands of the President and acts as a brake upon the power that is given to him by the Congress. If the embargo is repealed, then he will be at liberty to do what the act declares, and he can proceed on his own authority to declare these war zones, and, indirectly, if you please, safety zones, which is similar to the "safety bands" to which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] made reference. When the President proclaims safety zones by indirectly declaring war zones it does not differ from the "safety bands" or safety zones discussed at the Pan American Conference.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. THORKEKELSON. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I want to refer to the question I raised yesterday and to the article which has been inserted in the RECORD. If it is true that our Navy Department has, within the last few weeks, sent certain naval officials to England to sit down around the table with the English naval authorities and discuss and work out the details of the procedure that is to be followed by the British Navy and the American Navy during the next 2, 4, 6, 8, or 10 months, depending upon developments, and if those plans call for the shifting to Asiatic waters of a large portion of the American Navy, so that we may proceed as best we can under those adverse circumstances to protect British interests and American interests and French interests in Asiatic waters, including the Malay

Straits, the Dutch possessions, and all that territory, then what position will we be in, with the Neutrality Act on the books setting forth that the President shall not permit our merchant ships to enter war zones, in the event a war zone is declared in Asiatic waters by Japan or otherwise?

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for just a moment?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Excuse me just a moment. I submitted this question in much less detail yesterday and the gentleman's time expired and he did not have a chance to answer my question. If he will, I will appreciate very much his giving his opinion on that situation which is now in the making.

Mr. GEYER of California. Will the gentleman yield before he answers that question on this very point?

Mr. THORKEKELSON. Will the gentleman mind waiting just a moment?

Mr. GEYER of California. I would like to ask one question in regard to the question which the gentleman from Michigan asked.

Mr. THORKEKELSON. Very well.

Mr. GEYER of California. I am wondering if the gentleman from Michigan is fair when he says what he himself knows to be supposition—that certain things are being done by our Navy Department. I am wondering if that thing in itself is not doing the thing which we all deplore, perhaps stirring up distrust in our Nation, which at the present time certainly needs something besides that.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THORKEKELSON. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Insofar as my questions on this floor are concerned, I will take care of those myself. If the gentleman who has just spoken will refer to the President's speech of September 3, he will find where the President said that "we have the news," and if the gentleman will yield to me for the purpose, I will read an excerpt from the President's statement.

Mr. THORKEKELSON. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. There will be more to follow on this, I may advise the gentleman.

The President said:

It is, of course, impossible to predict the future. I have my constant stream of information from American representatives and other sources throughout the world, as you, the people of this country, are receiving news through your radios and your newspapers at every hour of the day. You are subject to no censorship of news, and I want to add that your Government has no information which it has any thought of withholding from you. I myself cannot and do not prophesy the course of events abroad, and the reason is that because I have, of necessity, such a complete picture of what is going on in every part of the world I do not dare to do so, and the other reason is that I think it is honest for me to be honest with the people of the United States. I hope the United States will keep out of this war. I believe that it will, and I give you assurances that every effort of your Government will be directed toward that end.

Now, I have the "news" the President refers to. I have rumors. I have propaganda. Sometimes I get a little of the "news behind the news." My question is based on some of the news behind the news, and I have a distinct right to put it in here. I think the gentleman is entirely out of order in making the insinuation which he did, and I will take future time to take care of it if he wants to proceed with it further.

Now, will the gentleman please go back to the question to which I referred?

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THORKEKELSON. No; I will not yield at this time.

Mr. GEYER of California. You will not yield for me to answer him?

Mr. THORKEKELSON. No. You can answer him in your own time. I want to say that the United States Government has no right to send our officers to Great Britain to arrange plans for aid or help to Great Britain, particularly at this time, because Great Britain is now at war. In doing that, it is equal to a declaration of war. It is *causus belli* as far as the German Government is concerned. The President or an

administration performing an act of that sort is liable, if Congress so decides, to meet a charge of treason, because any administration that deliberately enters into negotiations with a nation at war and arranges to assist that particular nation, without the authority of Congress, is committing an enemy act, and he adheres to the enemy.

Article III, section 3, of the Constitution reads:

Treason against the United States shall consist only in levying war against them or in adhering to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. THORKE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Montana asks unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. MASSINGALE. Mr. Speaker, for the present I shall have to object. I may not object later.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma object?

Mr. MASSINGALE. For the present; yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, October 12, 1939, at 12 o'clock noon.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 7580. A bill for the relief of Mary Savage; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KELLER:

H. R. 7581. A bill to admit Henry Hans Jacob Gummasson permanently to the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5673. By Mr. DONDERO: Petition of sundry citizens of Birmingham, Mich., asking that our Neutrality Act be preserved as it now stands, and urging that it be not repealed or modified; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5674. Also, resolution of the Detroit Postal Employees' Legislative Council, of Detroit, Mich., asking that proper action be taken to regulate and stabilize the price of food during the present war crisis; to the Committee on Agriculture.

5675. By Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois: Petition of Mrs. E. A. Tarbox and 16 other citizens of Rock Island City, Ill., protesting against selling to warring nations and loaning to belligerents; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5676. Also, petition of C. J. Klingeviel and 23 other citizens of Rock Island County, Ill., opposing any change or repeal of present Neutrality Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5677. Also, petition of Iris Newland and 23 other citizens of Colchester, Ill., to keep the neutrality law intact and to keep America out of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5678. Also, petition of Dr. T. H. Marsh, minister, and 150 women members of First Baptist Church of Moline, Ill., to keep America out of war and opposing repeal of the arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5679. Also, petition of 500 members of Parent Teachers Association Council, of East Moline, Ill., to keep America out of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5680. Also, petition of Mrs. J. F. Strombeck and 26 other citizens of Rock Island County, Ill., to keep America out of

war and not sell anything to belligerent nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5681. Also, petition of Mrs. Eric Sten and 32 other citizens of Rock Island County, Ill., to keep America out of war and not to sell anything to belligerent nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5682. Also, petition of Mrs. W. R. Mullinix and 22 other citizens of Rock Island County, Ill., to keep America out of war and not to sell anything to belligerent nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5683. Also, petition of Mrs. W. H. Exline and 12 signers of a petition, to keep America out of war and not to sell anything to belligerent nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5684. Also, petition of Elizabeth Ridenour and 18 signers of Rock Island County, Ill., to keep America out of war and not to sell anything to belligerent nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5685. Also, petition of Mrs. Raymond B. Johnson and 13 signers of Rock Island County, Ill., to keep America out of war and not to sell anything to belligerent nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5686. Also, petition of Mrs. N. W. Johnson and 23 signers of Rock Island County, Ill., to keep America out of war and not to sell anything to belligerent nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5687. Also, petition of Letty M. Henry and six signers of Rock Island County, Ill., to keep America out of war and not to sell anything to belligerent nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5688. Also, petition of Mrs. Sigurd Johansen and 13 signers of Rock Island County, Ill., to keep America out of war and not to sell anything to belligerent nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5689. Also, petition of Pastor C. G. Engdahl and 25 signers of Rock Island County, Ill., to keep America out of war and not to sell anything to belligerent nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5690. Also, petition of Alice Swanson and 38 other citizens of Rock Island County, Ill., to keep America out of war and not to sell anything to belligerent nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5691. Also, petition of Mrs. H. M. Park and 20 other citizens of Rock Island County, Ill., to keep America out of war and not to sell anything to belligerent nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5692. Also, petition of Frances Wehman and 53 other citizens of Rock Island County, Ill., to keep America out of war and against selling anything to belligerent nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5693. Also, petition of Mrs. L. B. Neighbour and 34 other citizens of Rock Island County, Ill., to keep America out of war and not to sell anything to belligerent nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5694. Also, petition of Mrs. H. L. Pressel and 23 other citizens of Rock Island County, Ill., to keep America out of war and not to sell anything to belligerent nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5695. Also, petition of Mrs. Luther McChesney and one other citizen of Rock Island County, Ill., to keep America out of war and not to sell anything to belligerent nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5696. Also, petition of Mrs. E. O. Reynolds and seven other citizens of Rock Island County, Ill., to keep America out of war and not to sell anything to belligerent nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5697. Also, petition of Mrs. A. H. Beitel and seven other citizens of Rock Island County, Ill., to keep America out of war and not sell anything to belligerent nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5698. Also, petition of Ruth Lowe and 13 other citizens of Rock Island County, Ill., to keep America out of war and not sell anything to belligerent nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5699. Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. H. L. Sandberg and 30 other signers of Rock Island County, Ill., to keep America out of war and not sell anything to belligerent nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5700. Also, petition of Mrs. Emil Slahey and 29 other citizens of Rock Island County, Ill., to keep America out of war and not sell anything to warring nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5701. Also, petition of Mrs. Earl Seabee and 11 other citizens of Rock Island County, Ill., to keep America out of war and not sell anything to belligerent nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5702. Also, petition of Mrs. Howard W. Gordon and 10 other citizens of Rock Island County, Ill., to keep America out of war, and not to sell anything to belligerent nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5703. Also, petition of Florence Hankins and nine other citizens of Rock Island County, Ill., to keep America out of war, and not to sell anything to belligerent nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5704. Also, petition of Mrs. James C. Valley and 14 other citizens of Rock Island County, Ill., protesting against revising the Neutrality Act; to Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5705. Also, petition of Ethel Heister and 2,700 members of the Illinois Federation of Women's Clubs, urging Congress to keep our country at peace, and vote against arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5706. Also, petition of S. M. Merrill and 14 other citizens of Carthage, Ill., protesting against repeal of the Neutrality Act as a whole or in part; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5707. Also, petition of E. M. McDaniel and 24 other citizens of Plymouth, Ill., opposing any change in the Neutrality Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5708. Also, petition of R. B. Lourie and 104 employees of John Deere Plow Co., of Moline, Ill., opposing our entry into any foreign war under any pretext, also suggesting that our Government take delivery of military supplies now under order of United States firms and should not be delivered to belligerent nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5709. Also, petition of Albert A. Teske and 45 other citizens of Rock Island County, Ill., urging the retaining of the arms embargo and to keep America out of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5710. Also, petition of Elizabeth Holmes and 25 other citizens of Rock Island County, Ill., to keep America out of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5711. Also, petition of Ralph De Porter and 51 other citizens of Rock Island County, Ill., to keep America out of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5712. Also, petition of Bess Gill and six other citizens of Macomb, Ill., to keep America out of war and to retain the neutrality law; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5713. Also, petition of R. Evans and 55 other citizens of Rock Island County, Ill., to keep America out of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5714. Also, petition of C. B. Parmelee and 31 other citizens of Rock Island County, Ill., to keep America out of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5715. Also, petition of Louis P. Reddig and six other citizens of Rock Island County, Ill., to keep America out of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5716. Also, petition of Cleone Wadman and 12 other citizens of Rock Island County, Ill., to keep America out of war and not to sell anything to belligerent nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5717. Also, petition of G. E. Rigg and 82 other citizens of Macomb, Ill., to keep America out of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5718. Also, petition of Frank Haws and 120 employees of the Western Stoneware Co., of Monmouth, Ill., urging retaining of present Neutrality Act as written, without amendments or repeal; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5719. Also, petition of Mrs. Franklin Johnson and 19 other citizens of Rock Island County, Ill., to keep America out of

war and not sell anything to belligerent nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5720. Also, petition of D. P. Nolan and nine other citizens of Galesburg, Ill., to keep America out of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5721. Also, petition of Mrs. R. J. McKee and 18 other citizens of Rock Island County, Ill., to keep America out of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5722. By Mr. KINZER: Petition of 200 citizens of Lancaster County, Pa., urging that the United States of America do not become involved in the current European war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5723. By Mr. LESINSKI: Petition of the Wyandotte Council of Clubs, representing over 5,000 members, favoring the repeal of the arms embargo to permit sales on a cash-and-carry basis in accordance with the President's plan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5724. Also, petition of Telesfor Sokolowski and other citizens of Wyandotte, Mich., urging the lifting of the arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5725. Also, petition of Dr. F. A. Pawlowski and other residents of the Sixteenth Congressional District, Detroit, Mich., urging the repeal of the embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5726. Also, petition of the Polish-American Citizens Club, requesting support of President Roosevelt's plan to lifting the arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5727. By Mr. RUTHERFORD: Petition of residents of Bradford County, Pa., protesting against the repeal or revision of the Neutrality Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5728. Also, petition of sundry residents of Wayne County, Pa., protesting against the repeal or revision of the Neutrality Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5729. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of Gertrude K. Kirsch, secretary, and Mrs. Paul Gregory, grand regent, Catholic Daughters of America, Court Carroll, No. 299, Wheeling, W. Va., urging no change in the present neutrality law; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5730. Also, petition of Mrs. John Besso and other citizens of Triadelphia, W. Va., urging no change in the present neutrality law; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5731. Also, petition of Verne Monroe, chairman, committee of the Cameron First Methodist Church, of Cameron, W. Va., urging no change in the present neutrality law; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5732. Also, petition of Donato Dittarelli, of Follansbee, W. Va., and 110 other citizens, urging that we keep the arms embargo, oppose the cash-and-carry, and keep America out of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5733. Also, Petition of Donald Habig and 50 citizens of Wheeling, W. V., urging that we use our influence and employ all means at our disposal to keep America out of war and free from foreign entanglements; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 12, 1939

(Legislative day of Wednesday, October 4, 1939)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Very Reverend Noble Cilley Powell, dean of the Cathedral of Saints Peter and Paul, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Father Almighty, of whose righteous will all things are and were created: Thou hast gathered the peoples of this land into a great nation and set before them a noble heritage. Do Thou deepen and strengthen the roots of our life in everlasting righteousness. Make us equal to the solemn trusts committed to our hands, reverent and grateful in the enjoyment and exercise of our freedom, just in the use of our power, wise and generous in our every relation one with another.